KENTUCKY CONFERENCE

PULPIT;

BEING SERMONS BY MINISTERS OF THE KENTUCKY CONFERENCE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.

ON

Doctrinal, Practical, and Scientific Subjects.

COMPILED BY

THE REV. R. HINER, D.D.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY

THE REV A. H. REDFORD, D.D.

NASHVILLE, TENN.:
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH.
1874.

INTRODUCTION.

THE "Kentucky Conference Pulpit" will be read with interest, not only by the Methodists of Kentucky, but by Christians who worship at other altars, and by those whose fortunes are not identified with any branch of the Church of Christ who properly appreciate religious truth. Not only within the bounds of the Kentucky Conference, the thoughts of whose preachers enrich these pages, but throughout the State, and far beyond its limits, the "Pulpit" will wend its way, offering instruction to many an anxious inquirer after the truth, and consolation to many an oppressed and aching heart. These sermons, emanating from the Kentucky Conference, whether we refer to their elegance of diction, their beauty of style, their profundity of thought, or to their soundness of doctrine—presented as they are in "thoughts that breathe and words that burn"—are well worthy the men by whom they were written.

Methodism to-day in Kentucky occupies a commanding eminence. In every part of the Commonwealth the spires of its temples point toward the house not made with hands, while its altars are crowded with listening thousands, and from its pulpits the tidings of a Redeemer's love are proclaimed by a faithful ministry whom God has called to preach the gospel.

Entering upon its career in Kentucky toward the close of the past century, it has gradually increased in strength, in power, and in influence, until more than ninety thousand are called by its name. Those who adhere to its fortunes, whether in the ministry or the laity, are not unmindful of the trials through which it has passed, nor of the difficulties with which it has been confronted. For every advance it has made, and every victory it has achieved, the struggle has been severe. On no occasion has it thought proper to rest upon the laurels it has gathered, or to repose amid the trophies it has won. The soil upon which its standard has been planted, and over which its banner spreads its folds to-day, has been prepared for its reception by labor and toil. Wherever Methodism has gone, on its errand of good, the doctrines of immersion and Calvinism preöccupied the minds and hearts of the people. To remove the wall of prejudice erected by these systems was no easy task, yet this had to be done

before the good seed could germinate and bring forth fruit. Wishing to live in peace with all who love the Lord Jesus, it has not, however, refused to enter the field of controversy where error was to be overthrown, or where truth required a champion. All along its history controversies have agitated the Church on these questions, contributing to its influence and adding to its triumphs, until now, whether we think of its struggling past, look upon its commanding present, or contemplate its glorious future, we rejoice that we have a name among its people.

A. H. REDFORD.

NASHVILLE, TENN., NOV. 10, 1874.

CONTENTS.

SERMON I. PAGE

NEITHER POVERTY NOR RICHES. By the Rev. H. Winslow Abbett..... 13

II.

BAPTISM NOT FOR REMISSION OF SINS. By the Rev. E. P Buckner, M.D..... 23

III.

MINISTERIAL SUPPORT. By the Rev. J. R. Deering..... 60

IV.

SCIENCE AND CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. T. J. Dodd, D.D..... 97

V

PAGE

THE OFFICE AND WORK OF THE SPIRIT. By the Rev. George T. Gould, A.M..... 119

VI.

REPENTANCE AND FAITH. By the Rev. Joseph W Fitch..... 144

VII.

THE NAME, WONDERFUL. By the Rev. S. X. Hall..... 169

VIII.

THE METHOD OF DIVINE REVELATION. By the Rev. H. A. M. Henderson, D.D..... 190

IX.

ANGELIC SYMPATHY. By the Rev. G. B. Poage. 208

X.

THE AGREEMENT OF THE MOSAIC AND SCIENTIFIC COSMOGONIES. By the Rev. J. C. Morris, A.M..... 222

XI.

PAGE

THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST. By the Rev. S. Noland 247

XII.

METHODISM. By the Rev. W. F. Poynter..... 265

XIII.

THE ATONEMENT: ORIGIN AND REMEDY OF EVIL. By the Rev. S. W Speer, D.D..... 287

XIV

IS THE TRUST BETRAYED? By the Rev. C. Taylor..... 306

XV

THE MERCY OF GOD IN CHRIST. By the Rev. W. F Taylor..... 316

XVI.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT—ITS DURATION. By the Rev. H. Pearce Walker..... 330

XVII.

PAGE

THE NOVELTIES OF CAMPBELLISM CONTRASTED WITH CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. C. W Miller, A.M. 388

XVIII.

THE DIVINE NATURE AND THE DIVINE GOVERNMENT MYSTERIOUS, YET PRODUCTIVE OF JOY AND GLADNESS. By the Rev. Drummond Welburn 444

XIX.

INFANT BAPTISM, AS TAUGHT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By the Rev. M. Evans..... 456

XX.

THE CROSS OF CHRIST. By the Rev. Joseph W Mitchell, A.M..... 499

XXI.

A TREATISE ON THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT. By the Rev. R. Hiner, D.D..... 513

XXII.

PAGE

THE MODE, OR ACTION, OF BAPTISM. By the Rev. J. Ditzler 558

XXIII.

THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM—THE DANGER OF TRIFLING WITH GOD. By the Rev. T. F. Vanmeter 594

XXIV.

THE DANCING DAMSEL. By the Rev. James A. Henderson, M.D. 617

SERMONS.

NEITHER POVERTY NOR RICHES.

BY THE REV H. WINSLOW ABBETT.

"Give me neither poverty nor riches." Prov. xxx. 8.

THESE are *royal* words. I mean that they are the words not so much of a king—for it matters little, for the present use, whether they are the expression of Solomon or of another divinely illumined person, Agur—as that they embody a *kingly* sentiment. They are evidently the words of "a wise and understanding heart." They show that a conflict has been had, that a conquest has been made, and that order and government have been restored out of anarchy and riot. These words show that the mind was gathering up those reins which had been wrenched from it by sin, and was drawing a curb upon the passions and affections, and holding them unto the golden mean.

The mind is here assuming its Heaven-given but hell-wrenched authority. The affections are working in harmony with that authority. The balance of power is in favor of self-control.

The text exhibits a healthy state of the mental

and moral elements of the author. The understanding is clear; it accepts in confidence the sanctions by which law is maintained; the will is healed of its paralysis—it yields obedience; the conscience is aroused—it realizes its obligation.

It is said that light and air are necessary to perfect organic development. So, to have strength and symmetry of soul, the Sun of righteousness must arise upon it, attended by the healing breath of the Spirit of God.

Christ must be that bread of life, feeding upon which the soul must grow. His righteousness must be that light which, under the spectrum analysis of the gospel, will give all the elements of strength and vigor.

It is said that the ancients considered the following petition as the best that could be offered to the gods: *Give me a sound mind in a sound body.* If this petition had originated in a mind furnished with that wisdom "that standeth in the top of high places, that crieth at the gates, at the entry of the city, at the coming in of the doors—whose instruction is to be received rather than silver; and whose knowledge rather than choice gold; that is better than rubies; by whom kings reign, and princes decree justice"—I should hold that it meant a great deal. Then it would not simply mean a mind free from mania, and a body free from pain; but it would mean a mind sound in all of the elements of a mind—every part healthy, and ever ready to do its own office without drafting, like sickly members, upon some other. Such a petitioner would pray for a mind capable of acquiring knowl-

edge. Let the perception of truth be clear and strong; let the memory be retentive—capable of retaining truth. Such a petitioner would pray for a fair ability to *handle* knowledge, to use it as a capital to create interest; he would ask that there be no poverty in conception. Such a petitioner would pray to be delivered from some modern teachers who act as though the taught had no farther use for their *crammings* than to be stuffed; and yet he would pray equally fervently not to be betrayed into the hands of those teachers, *per contra*, who, being disgusted with the cramming process, have supposed that every thing was to be attained by dry lecturing, and have dismissed the taught as dry and empty as a "green" barrel just sent from the hands of the cooper. Turning over the text to the use of such a petitioner, he would say, with his eye on these teachers, "Give me neither *poverty* nor *riches.*"

Sobriety is one of the helping agents in giving body and symmetry to the text. Let me be *sober;* give me equipoise of mind. Let my mental arrangements be those of a delicately-adjusted balance, registering value not by bulk, but by weight; let no crazy estimate, no fictitious value, be put by me on the configuration of things; let my judgment be not from what things *appear*, but from what they *are;* let not my eye, but my soul, be the index of value of the object considered.

Had that last and ill-fated King of Babylon, whose cruelty and jealousy were only equaled by his impiety, had the mental furniture of the author of the text, he would not have earned that scathing reproof

of the prophet of God; nor should those ideas of *numbering*, *weighing*, and *dividing*, have been so fearfully applied to him as a mass of failure. Had he had his moral finish, he would have valued the drinking from golden vessels as nothing, when God is thereby sinned against, and the jewelry of his house desecrated. Gold has no value, and should have no charm, in itself. It rises and falls on the balance of value relatively. It is the proper use that makes it weigh heavy. Used improperly, it is lighter than vanity. I ask not for that power that feeds upon ill-gotten gain, or that rules over cruelly-acquired empire; that revels in sin, or that fattens upon iniquity. Why, such a power as that would starve to death on *justice* and *righteousness*. If this is a necessity of riches, I take up the second member of my text, and repeat it, trilling every syllable in it: *Give me not riches.*

Discreetness must be some of the mental strength that is spent upon the conception and birth of the text. This is to have a well-defined purpose, and to exercise wisdom in avoiding erroneous means, and selecting the best to accomplish that purpose. The acknowledgment of the Lord and the keeping of his law are the author's purpose. He considers ostentation and deceit unlawful means to accomplish his purpose; hence he prays, "Remove far from me vanity and lies." The acknowledgment of the Lord, especially in his providence, was his aim. He was afraid lest he might be led to deny the Lord under too bountiful a supply of earth's provision; hence he petitioned, "Feed me with food convenient for me"—"lest I be full and

deny thee." He looked upon riches as an unwisely-coveted means to accomplish such a purpose. He would not be found in company with those moderns who pant for riches—yes, *pant*—for they have chased it until they are out of breath; who pant for riches as the thirsty hart panteth for the water-brook; who engage in all trades and traffic, and who seek all sorts of offices, and who advocate the support of grand State enterprises upon the revenue of a lottery-wheel, for its acquisition. These "hunters" of wealth are deceived with the self-imposed sophistry that by its possession they would be more useful.

It is under this vain delusion that men holding membership with the Church of God are seen experimenting with every newly-invented scheme, or old one renewed, to acquire money. Whence draw these gentlemen their inspiration? What oracles do they consult? Their zeal is certainly not fired by the word of God. Their wisdom is surely not that which cometh from his testimonies; they have not studied the author of the text; they have not been drilled by the same masters; they have not caught the same sentiment. He desired to do good; he desired to honor God; but he was afraid of the possession of riches for its accomplishment. Lost in the gratifications of wealth, he trembled lest he should deify its power, and ask, "Who is the Lord?"

Men who deny the Lord that bought them make use of politics as a pony upon which to ride into places of wealth. Their sophistry to their bamboozled brethren is, "When we shall have attained our desires, we shall be in a much better position to

benefit our Church and country." But once in a lucrative office, they are so much engaged in matters of control relating to others that they lose the art of self-control. The school of politics is ill-sought to discipline the affections; it is a bad school of morals. The politician may have some scruple about worship; but when his doubts assume the body and form of determination, he erects, like Adrian his master, a statue of Adonis in the manger of Bethlehem. Like Adrian, he visits Mt. Calvary, but it is to worship in the temple of his own erection to Jupiter. The politician has something to do with the Bible. It is to banish it from your public schools. Like Adrian, after a career of political success, having conquered men and measures, he is called to meet in a face-to-face encounter an enemy for whom he had prepared no weapon. Death is approaching. Adrian alternates between magic arts to retard his foe, and the use of instruments to hasten his attack. The well-versed politician is dying. He has no magic by which to control his distracted spirit. He has controlled others; himself he cannot control. We catch his despairing address to his soul: "My roving soul, pleasant guest and companion of my body, unto what places, causing paleness, cold and barren, wilt thou now go? Thou shalt no more, as aforetime, afford me mirthful jest." And he is gone!

An ancient satirist said of those of his time: *Our first prayers generally, and what are best known to all our temples, are that our riches may increase; that our fortune may improve; that our money-chests might be the largest in all the forum.* The same heathen was

wise enough to see, and to express in the same satire, that the things for which we pray and importune the gods are either ruinous to us or useless. Of this I say history is repeating itself. An infant's estate is scarcely safe until his majority. There is many a Glaucus who interviews himself about the dangers of forswearing. If Philip made Demosthenes—if Rome made, by her corruption, Juvenal—for whom may we yet look as the creature of the United States?

It was when Rome became the richest city in the world that her pastors demanded as a right the reference to her by neighboring Churches of questions of doubt, of difficulty. It was then that her bishops grasped with an iron grip that yielding which had been voluntary, and made it a necessity. It was when, by her wealth and power, she became the queen of cities that her pastors assumed to be universal dictators of the conscience. Then the Church of her bishops assumed to be the mother of us all. To her interpretation of the law we must submit with the complacency of children. It was when she stood alone in her intoxication of supremacy, her rivals Alexandria and Antioch having been silenced, that such dogmatical submission began to be required. In seeking a *pastorate*, then, sobriety and discreetness would direct not to the politically powerful and wealthy; not to that Church that creates kings, nor to the one that is the creature of kings. Disestablishment would be the choice of the text. And yet it would not direct to a poverty-stricken Church as such. The author of the text teaches that *poverty* in itself has no virtue. A poor

congregation, destitute of the vital principle of a Church, may steal, and is very likely to attempt to steal, all that is good from a Church better circumstanced. With rich and powerful "Babylon the great, the mother of harlots, and the abominations of the earth," on the one hand, demanding the universal surrender of conscience, and on the other a poor, envious, graceless, godless congregation—each inviting a pastor, place a priest of God, and with an eye of pity for each—yet as to intrinsic attractions for him he exclaims, "Give me neither *poverty* nor *riches*."

Again: A congregation—a Church—looking for a pastor would do well to practice upon the soul of the text. My text has two parts—a body and a soul. "Hard cash" is its body. Every endowment, of which hard cash is the symbol, is its soul. Then, a Church in selecting a pastor has need of the wisdom that would dictate, "Give me neither poverty nor riches." Many a congregation has been swamped by a wealth of words. The foaming, dashing current of a preacher's words has inundated it. Those set for the defense of the Church in this respect—for the selection of the preacher—have been swept away from their equipoise by the stream, confused by the dashing spray, and drowned by the flood of words of the preacher. But reason, left, like rocks that lift their heads above mountain torrent, unaffected either by the noise or spray of water-fall at their base, verifies the poet's statement of eighteen hundred years ago: "An excessive supply of words has ruined many, and the orator's eloquence has become his own bier."

Let the preacher be "sober;" let him cultivate ideas as well as words; let him remember that the body has need of food as well as of clothing. A wordy preacher, destitute of ideas, is like a finely-dressed skeleton-rack before a Jewish clothing-store—he is only the symbol of a man.

Very great intellectual endowments might not be a wise requisition in a congregation selecting a pastor. It would tend to divert that high esteem produced through love for his work's sake into an admiration of the preacher for his talent's sake. If a very great difference of intellectual vigor and brilliancy was manifest between pastor and people, it would tend to make the preacher dogmatical—as in Rome.

Again: A man of excessive *feeling* is not the best choice for a pastor.

To be a preacher, the emotional of a man must be sensitive, but not passionate. The one kindles when it has fuel; the other blazes as wild-fire. The one produces a Democritus to laugh, whenever he sets his foot beyond his threshold, at the follies of men; or a Heraclitus to weep over their miseries. The other produces a man "to weep with those that weep, and to rejoice with those that do rejoice."

But poverty of these elements—words, intellect, and feeling—is as lamentable as a plethora. A man of ideas without words—like a body without clothing—is not to be seen in public. A preacher without intellect—like Balaam's beast—is dependent, to instruct, upon the heavy spurring of a prophet and the miraculous filling of his mouth by the Lord.

A preacher without feeling is but the statue of Apollo, holding the lyre and the bow and arrows; but his lyre never charms, and his arrows never kill.

The practice of the text would give financial health to the nation, health to the several States, health to the counties thereof, health to communities, health to corporations, health to families, health to individuals. It would destroy in the national system that pestiferous disease, embezzlement; it would destroy in the corporation, fraud, and in the individual, forgery.

In conclusion, since poverty reduces beneficent resources, destroys competition, engenders want, and subjects to many and grievous temptations, a prayer to be delivered from it is right, and in harmony with the petition taught by the Master to his disciples: "Lead us not into temptation."

And since wealth—especially its love—begets cares, monopolizes time, drowns the love of God, exhausts thoughts of moral obligation, substitutes for self-denial the denial of God, it is religious to pray, *Give me neither poverty* nor *riches.*

BAPTISM NOT FOR REMISSION OF SINS.

BY THE REV E. P. BUCKNER, M.D.

"Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts ii. 37, 38.

THE great object here proposed to men alarmed and anxious about their present condition, is "the remission of sins." In what manner this great blessing is to be obtained, will constitute the substance of our present inquiry. Three things are commanded in the text—repentance, baptism, faith. The first two are expressed, the last is implied; for surely Peter would never have exhorted *unbelieving* Jews to be baptized into the name of one whom they rejected. A prime question is, With what does the remission of sins stand connected? Is it with repentance, with baptism, with faith, or with any two or all three united? The original *design* of baptism ought, at least in part, to answer these inquiries. That baptism on the day of Pentecost was intended to secure an object different from that which it subserved under the ministry of John the Baptist and the disciples of Jesus Christ, is what we have never been able to find. Originally, it sig-

nified always the same thing. It was administered uniformly, not in order to, but in reference to, the remission of sins—sometimes before and sometimes after the reception of pardon. It was a symbol of inward spiritual cleansing. Are baptism, then, and the remission of sins inseparably connected together? If so, a new condition has been superadded and made obligatory since the day of Pentecost; and the text is, therefore, in direct contradiction of all the teachings of God and of Jesus Christ upon the same subject from the beginning of the world until the time when the apostles were "endued with power from on high." Waiving farther consideration of the passage for the moment, we proceed to state carefully the circumstances surrounding St. Peter when the words first fell from his inspired lips.

Our blessed Lord laid down his life for the salvation of the world on Friday evening at three o'clock, was entombed at six on the same day, and resumed his life again before daylight on the morning of the third day following. Thus he was dead about thirty-nine hours, and in the grave about thirty-six, before he was "declared to be the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead." From the resurrection to the ascension into heaven was a period of forty days, during which time Jesus showed himself alive to his disciples several times "by many infallible proofs," and "spake to them of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." At the end of the forty days, after giving to the eleven disciples their great commission, he made them this promise, and laid this injunction upon them: "And, be-

hold, I send the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high." (Luke xxiv. 49.) After the lapse of ten days, the promise was fulfilled, the injunction taken off, "and the day of Pentecost had fully come." But what, in the meantime, were the dispirited apostles and the timid disciples meditating and doing? They assembled in an upper room, and there held, for ten days, the most earnest and devotional prayer-meeting that ever offered petitions and poured out supplications to God. The vacant apostolate of Judas was filled by Matthias, "and he was numbered with the eleven apostles." The Pentecost now approached, and "they were all with one accord in one place;" still praying to God, either in the temple or some adjacent house. "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a mighty rushing wind, and filled the house where they were sitting. And there appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." The Jewish sojourners from sixteen different nations of the earth, together with the multitude of Israel proper, were not only amazed, but confounded, when they heard the apostles, all illiterate, and ignorant of every language except their own, declare, by miraculous endowment, to every man, in the tongue wherein he was born, the saving truths of redemption, and the conditions of immediate pardon and hope. In the midst of the amazement, doubt, and

fear that prevailed, a portion of the people inquired, "What meaneth this?" But others mocking, and with a meaner spirit, said: "These men are full of new wine." This vile calumny against the apostles of the ascended Saviour, and infamous blasphemy against the Holy Ghost that filled them all, roused up the spirit of defense, apology, and vindication in the heart of Peter, who "lifted up his voice" and hushed to silence, overwhelmingly, the last utterance of prejudice and skepticism. Having now gained the attention and approval of the multitude, he determined to turn both to the very best practical account. Accordingly, that the people might have accurate information and authoritative instruction upon the great facts and phenomena now exciting universal attention, he took, as a foundation for his remarks, Joel ii. 28–32, and delivered a discourse plain in its thoughts and facts, simple in its structure, but powerful and unprecedented in its effects. Thousands were made to fear and tremble, feel and deprecate the burden of their guilt. The account given of them at the conclusion of the sermon is in these words: "Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

There is a large and respectable sect of Christians in the world whose entire system of religion, or evangelism, is built almost exclusively upon the most literal interpretation of these words. Our purpose is

calmly and kindly to show that their exegesis of this and other passages of Scripture is altogether erroneous, besides developing and defending what is most evidently and unmistakably the fundamental teachings of the text itself. "For" is regarded by our "Christian" friends as connecting baptism and the remission of sins in the relation of cause and effect, and therefore as a word necessarily expressive of design; consequently, that baptism and the remission of sins are inseparably connected together. That this is no misrepresentation of their views will be seen by reference to pp. 206, 207 of a cheap volume entitled "Tracts for the People," and especially on p. 207, in a long foot-note specifically devoted to this very preposition "for." Although we are not bound to prove a negative in support of the truth, yet it is sometimes expedient so to do; and we intend, therefore, showing that the interpretation given to the text by the Christian sect already alluded to is not legitimate, and, consequently, that their whole system of evangelism based upon it is a mistake, and hence must fall to the ground. They affirm that "for" necessarily means, in the passage before us, "in hope of," "in expectation of," "conducive to," "toward the obtaining of," "in order to the arrival at, or possession of," and consequently that it can teach nothing but the dogma of baptism for remission of sins. But, on the contrary, it might be affirmed upon equal, if not higher, authority that "for" often means "because of," "in consequence of," "in consideration of," "on account of," and "*in reference to.*" The sense thus given, and especially the last definition, is according to the analogy

of faith, and therefore consistent with the entire word of God upon the same subject; whereas, the meaning that evolves the doctrine of baptism for remission of sins is not only inconsistent, but greatly contradictory, as witness the following pointed and exhaustive passages of Scripture: John iii. 14, 15, 18, 36; John vi. 40, 47; John xi. 25, 26; Acts x. 43; Acts xvi. 31; Romans iv. 5; Romans v. 1; Romans i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 21; Eph. ii. 8; 1 John v. 10; 1 Peter ii. 6. Why, then, should such a teaching be preferred? Or, why should a multitude of the plainest scriptures be contradicted, or made to mean almost nothing, that one single preposition, instead of Christ, might be "all and in all?" Or, are hundreds of passages, all teaching most unequivocally the same thing, to be gratuitously interpreted by a mere preposition? or, is not that preposition to be rather understood, if there be a difficulty in ascertaining its significance and force, by considering the plain, fixed, and unmistakable meaning? Most evidently the latter is the correct principle.

We now raise the fundamental question again, With what does the remission of sins stand connected? No satisfactory answer, however, can be given to this inquiry without first considering the meaning of the terms used, and thus educing the full force and significance of the text. It has been supposed that a slight change in the collocation of the words, "not forbidden by just criticism nor candid interpretation," would bring out the precise thought of the apostle, and so remove all difficulties. The transposition would cause the passage to read:

"Repent—for the remission of sins, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." From this, "it will be seen that remission of sins is in *consequence* of repentance, and baptism is urged *as a suitable mode of testifying* that repentance, because an instituted rite of entering into a new visible relation to Jesus Christ, the true Messiah." While these principles are true in themselves, it is nevertheless questionable, to say the least, whether we are justifiable in resorting to the transposition given for the purpose of explaining the text. It is absolutely certain that baptism "for the remission of sins," in the sense of *in order to* their remission, is not taught in the passage; for in another of Peter's sermons, preached after he and John had healed the impotent man at the "Beautiful" gate of the temple, he says: "*Repent* ye therefore, and be *converted* [turn to God], that your sins may be *blotted out*." (Acts iii. 19.) There can be no doubt as to what is the precise teaching of this quotation; but one scripture cannot contradict another, all being true; hence, it is impossible that Acts ii. 38 should authorize the heretical dogma of baptism for remission of sins. Both passages, then, must teach the same thing; but baptism is not named at all, nor even so much as hinted at, in Acts iii. 19; yet the "*blotting out*" of "*sins*" is there named, and that, too, in connection with repentance and conversion. A grosser perversion of any portion of God's word was never invented than when Acts ii. 38 is made to support the notion that "immersion into water" and the forgiveness of sins are inseparably connected

together. Those persons who believe in this antiquated heresy admit that both of the utterances of Peter just given mean precisely the same thing. With this candid acknowledgment, we do not see how they can maintain their consistency, and still continue to teach that water-baptism is "for [*in order to*] the remission of sins."

There are two methods of expounding the text, either of which removes all difficulties, and both of which result in the establishment of the same great principle.

1. "For remission of sins" is an idiom, intended to to express the fact that "JESUS CHRIST" is the only source whence the remission of sins can come, for "neither is there salvation in *any other;* for there is *none other name* [person] under heaven given among men, *whereby we must be saved.*" (Acts iv. 12.) It follows, then, that Peter did not intend to state "what repentance is for, or what baptism is for, but to set forth the RELATION that 'Jesus Christ' sustains to the remission of sins." According to this interpretation, it would be perfectly correct, and develop the true meaning of the apostle, to read the passage thus: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." If it were proper for the LXX. to call the scape-goat, which at the first was but the symbol of bearing away sin, *a remission*, how much more is it befitting to call "JESUS CHRIST" so? This criticism leaves the original word here translated "for" without an individual representative in a correct rendering of the passage?

2. The phrase, "in the name of Jesus Christ,"

immediately preceding "for the remission of sins," is also an idiomatic expression, and is the exact equivalent of *faith*, or *trust*, in Jesus Christ; and this *faith*, or *trust*, in Jesus Christ is for the remission of sins. The original word *epi*, here translated "in," means *on*, or *upon*, and it "denotes, in general, the foundation *on* which an action, or state, rests. To do something [then] *upon* the name of some one is, in doing it, to *rely upon*, or have reference to, the name of some one." (Winer.) "The word name, in Scripture, is often used where not a mere designation is intended, but the object itself, as so designated, and thereby made known to us. It is in this sense that the word is used of God so frequently in the Bible in such phrases as the name of Jehovah, my name, the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, etc. Men are commanded to put their trust in God's name—*i. e.*, in God himself as revealed. Men believe on his name (John i. 12; 1 John v. 13); are baptized for his name (Acts xix. 5); have life through his name (John xx. 31); are saved by his name (Acts iv. 12); are justified by his name (1 Cor. vi. 11); assemble in his name (Matt. xviii. 20); do miracles by his name (Mark xvi. 17; Acts xvi. 18); where the meaning of the statement can be obtained only by regarding the phrase as indicating the Saviour as manifested for the help and benefit of man." (Kitto's Cyclopedia, word "Name.") It cannot be denied that "the name of God is often used as synonymous with *faith in*, or *reliance upon*, God." The same is true of Jesus Christ in the New Testament. "In his *name* shall the Gentiles *trust*" (Matt. xii. 21); "where two or

three are gathered together *in my name*" (Matt. xviii. 20); "whatsoever ye shall ask *in my name*" (John xiv. 13); "that ye might have life *through his name*" (John xx. 31). This use of God's name as synonymous with *faith*, or *trust*, in him was perfectly familiar to the Jewish mind; hence the appropriateness of Peter's address. When, therefore, the apostle said, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," he meant by the expression, "in the name of Jesus Christ," *believing in*, *relying upon*, *trusting in*, or *confiding in*, Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. Now that this exposition is the true one, we have the "unequivocal declaration of Peter himself upon other occasions." Eight or nine years after the Pentecost, an angel told Cornelius to "send men to Joppa, and call for Simon, whose surname is Peter; who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved" (Acts xi. 13, 14). The object, then, of Peter's mission to this praying Gentile was to tell him *how he might be saved*. "Now, if on the day of Pentecost he taught that baptism is for the remission of sins, we might certainly expect to hear him tell Cornelius the same thing; and if on the day of Pentecost he taught that *faith* in 'JESUS CHRIST' is for the remission of sins, we might certainly expect to hear him tell Cornelius the same thing." Turning to Acts x. 43, we hear him saying to Cornelius, "To him [Jesus Christ] give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever BELIEVETH in him shall receive REMISSION OF SINS." Is not this in perfect harmony with what has been given as the

just interpretation of the language used at Pentecost? But we have this matter definitively settled on another occasion, and that, too, by Peter himself. When the apostles and elders came together at Jerusalem to consider the question whether circumcision was necessary to salvation, Peter rose up and said, God "put *no difference* between us [Jews] and them [Gentiles], *purifying their hearts by faith*" (Acts xv. 9). It is here positively asserted that the moral purification of the hearts of both Jews and Gentiles was conditioned upon "FAITH" in Jesus Christ. God "put *no difference*" between them, purifying one by water and the other by faith, but all were cleansed upon the same principle—*faith*, or *trust*, in Jesus Christ. This was in perfect accordance with the testimony of "all the prophets," with the preaching of John the Baptist, with all the teachings of Jesus Christ, and with the gospel as proclaimed by Peter's fellow-apostles. Once more. About thirty-one or two years after the day of Pentecost, Peter had occasion to write his first Epistle, in which, referring to the days of the flood, he uses this language: "Wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure [antitype] whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ" (1 Peter iii. 20, 21). Here, although it is affirmed that "baptism now saves us," yet it is emphatically stated that this salvation does not consist in "putting away the filth of the flesh"—*i. e.*, in putting away the sins, transgressions, and iniquities of our

depraved moral natures—but in "the answer of a good conscience toward God." "Answer" here means "*demand*," or "*requirement*," and the sense is that baptism lays upon us an obligation to cherish and preserve a good conscience, or piety, toward God. This is what it "demands" and "requires" as an ordinance of God, symbolizing the invisible work of the Holy Spirit upon the heart. In this way it "saves" us, and in no other. Having no efficacy in "putting away the filth of the flesh," it cannot be a condition "for the remission of sins." From the exposition now given, and from the authorities adduced, are we not justified in the proposition that Peter never preached baptism upon any occasion for the remission of sins? The fair conclusion, then, is that, whatever else may be true, baptism is not inseparably connected with the remission of sins. It is not one of the conditions of pardon, and never was; for both John the Baptist (Mark i. 4; Acts xix. 4) and Jesus Christ (Matt. iv. 17; Mark i. 15) preached repentance and faith, and not baptism, for the remission of sins.

Genuine repentance always implies faith, and true faith just as certainly always implies repentance; hence the principles here contended for, as the only conditions that were required in order to pardon on the day of Pentecost, are powerfully confirmed by the great fact stated in Acts ii. 44: "All that *believed* were together, and had all things common." Now, if baptism, as an act of obedience on the part of the sinner in turning to God, had been one step nearer to pardon than faith, would not that rite have been named instead of faith?

Or, if it had been equally necessary to the forgiveness of sins, with an implicit faith in the blood of Jesus Christ, would not the passage have read, "All that believed and were baptized were together and had all things common?"

But is there no contradiction in all this to the authoritative teaching of Christ himself? Let us see. "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that *repentance* and *remission of sins* should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem" (Luke xxiv. 46, 47). The conditions here given on which the remission of sins is made to depend, and that, too, for "all nations," for there is "no difference," are repentance and faith—the last indubitably implied by the force and significance of the powerful idiomatic expression, "IN HIS NAME." Now, did not Peter on the day of Pentecost preach the very doctrine of his Master as here developed? If he did not, but added to its principles that of baptism for remission of sins, he then violated the purpose of God and the established laws of human pardon.

Perhaps, however, some would rather have another version of the great commission: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 18–20). What is a just analysis of this passage? First, "the apostles" were to disciple "all

nations" by baptizing them. Secondly, they were to teach them all things whatsoever had been commanded them. Thirdly, the perpetual presence of the Lord Jesus Christ with all his ministers and people is most solemnly promised. There is no baptism for [*in order to*] the remission of sins here.

But it may be that even this form of the commission is not satisfactory. Let us, then, try another: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark xvi. 15, 16). As it is impossible that Jesus Christ should have contradicted himself when giving the essential facts or principles connected with the same subject, we will let him explain his own oracle, and thus, "comparing spiritual things with spiritual things," we shall get at the truth absolutely; for "the scriptures cannot be broken." "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever *believeth* in him should *not perish*, but *have everlasting life*. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that BELIEVETH on him is NOT CONDEMNED: but he that *believeth not* is *condemned already*, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." (John iii. 16–18). Could any thing be plainer or more directly to the point? Faith, in the sense of trust in the Son of God, always implying repentance, is the grand condition upon which salvation is promised to the penitent soul. But what of baptism? It "is the outward sign of regeneration."

That repentance always implying faith, and faith always implying repentance, are the only scriptural terms of the pardon of sin, there can be no doubt, for Peter himself thus settles the matter after the day of Pentecost: "Him (Jesus Christ) hath God exalted with his own right hand to be a Prince and a SAVIOUR, for to give *repentance* to Israel, and *forgiveness of sins.*" (Acts v. 31.) Then this same apostle came up to Jerusalem from the house of Cornelius. The Jews "contended with him," because he had gone in unto the "uncircumcised," and had eaten with them. In justification, however, of his conduct, he rehearsed the whole matter to them from the beginning; and St. Luke then says: "When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted *repentance unto life.*" (Acts xi. 18.) The Jews that gave utterance to this sentiment were the very same persons —many of them, if not all—that became Christians on the day of Pentecost. Did they speak from their own experience relative to the remission of sins, or upon the supposition that God had saved the Gentiles in a way wholly different from themselves? Doubtless the former, yet they made no reference to baptism whatever. And what is still more remarkable, on the supposition that baptism is for [in order to] the remission of sins, is that Peter did not tell them that they were mistaken in their judgment of the matter; for their language is flatly contradictory of all conceivable ideas looking to so miserable an absurdity as baptism for remission of sins.

"*Facts*," that occurred after the day of Pentecost, all supporting the same conclusions already reached, and contradictory of the notion that baptism is the last act on the part of the sinner in turning to God for the forgiveness of his sins, will now be in order.

1. After the murder of St. Stephen, Saul of Tarsus made havoc of the Church in Jerusalem. The membership thereof were all scattered abroad except the apostles. "Philip went down to Samaria, and preached *Christ* unto them." Being thoroughly convinced, by the miracles wrought, that Jesus was the long-expected Messiah, the people "believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ," and "they were baptized, both men and women." (Acts viii. 12.) But what was the object here had in view by baptism? Was it administered "*for*" [in order to] "the remission of sins?" The record, as regards any such notion, is silent. If, however, the principle is true, Philip ought boldly and clearly to have preached it on this occasion, for the Samaritans knew nothing at all of what had been taught as the conditions of pardon, on the day of Pentecost. "The Jews and the Samaritans had *no dealings together*." Therefore the necessity was not more urgent at Jerusalem, on the Pentecost, that the information given, as to the terms on which immediate pardon depended, should be clear and specific than now at Samaria. But, after all, perhaps none of these persons became Christians, either by their faith or by their baptism; for Peter and John, hearing of the work of God, had to come down from Jerusalem, pray for, and then lay their hands on, them,

before they received the Holy Ghost, "for as yet he was fallen on none of them, only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." If they were all Christians before the Holy Ghost, in answer to apostolic prayers, fell on them, how can we account for the fact that Simon Magus was not also himself a Christian? for he, with all the others, "believed and was baptized." Precisely that which is said of all is said of him until we come to prayer and the Holy Ghost. Here, then, are just as many "facts" as there were persons converted at Samaria, and who received the Holy Ghost after they were baptized, proving, unquestionably, that baptism has nothing whatever essentially to do in the remission of sins; and that it only points out, as a symbol, in the most beautiful and appropriate manner, the purifying influence of the Holy Ghost upon the heart and conscience of the man who is "born of God."

2. Another great "fact" is the case of the eunuch (Acts viii. 26–39.) When Philip closed his evangelic labors in Samaria, an angel directed him to go toward the south between Jerusalem and Gaza. In the course of his journey he came upon a man of great authority, an eunuch, under Candace, Queen of Ethiopia, returning from Jerusalem in his chariot, and reading the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. "Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot." On complying with this direction, the eunuch asked whether the prophet spoke of himself or of some other man in the chapter referred to. "Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him JESUS." The chariot was very soon by the side of

a certain water, seeing which the nobleman said to Philip: "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou *believest* with *all thine heart*, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I *believe* that JESUS CHRIST IS THE SON OF GOD." There is no intimation, but evidence rather to the contrary, that Philip, in preaching Jesus to this man, ever named baptism to him at all: he asked for it *himself*. But how could he have known any thing about either its nature or necessity, if the rite had not been fully explained to him? He learned the whole matter from Isa. lii. 15, just seven verses back from where he was reading when Philip found him: "So shall he SPRINKLE many nations." As far, then, as the account goes (and that is what governs us), Philip never enjoined baptism upon this man as necessary to the forgiveness of sins. On the contrary, he was rather cautious in its administration, using language which plainly showed that he could not, or would not, baptize him until he was first convinced of the genuineness of his faith in Jesus Christ. But when Philip told the eunuch that he could not be baptized except upon believing with all his heart, did the answer of the latter prove that his sins were remitted? The affirmative is true, for "whosoever *believeth* that JESUS IS THE CHRIST is BORN OF GOD." (1 John v. 1.) The eunuch believed this, and hence the point is settled. But there is a stronger statement on the subject still: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye might BELIEVE that JESUS IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD; and that BELIEVING [this

truth] ye might have LIFE through his name." (John xx. 30, 31.) Here "life" to the soul is conditioned upon the exercise of faith in "Jesus Christ, the Son of God;" the two, therefore, are inseparably connected in the economy of the gospel. But the eunuch's faith, as avowed to Philip, is in the very words, precisely, of St. John as here quoted. Hence, as "life" was promised in the one case, it must have been received and enjoyed in the other. This being so, the eunuch was "born of God," "justified by faith," and had his sins remitted before it was possible for him to be baptized. This was about three years after the day of Pentecost.

3. The next instance of faith, repentance, prayer, conversion, and baptism, is that of Saul of Tarsus. The "facts" are related Acts ix. 17, 18. A bigot in religion, and enraged by malice, this man obtained letters of authority to persecute the followers of Christ at Damascus, as he had already done in Jerusalem. On his way, when in the immediate neighborhood of the place, "there shined round about him a light from heaven," and he was struck down to the earth. He cried to heaven in all the earnestness of his soul for instruction upon the subject of his present duty, "and the Lord [Jesus Christ] said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee *what thou must do.*" Now utterly blind, a guide led him into the city, where he remained three days and three nights without either food, drink, or sleep. At the end of this time, God told Ananias, in a vision, to go and administer to his spiritual wants. "And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house; and putting his hands upon him said, Brother Saul,

the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales: and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized." The design in sending Ananias to Saul was twofold: first, that he might receive his sight, and, second, that he might be filled with the Holy Ghost. Evidently, this grand spiritual work was effected instantly with the falling of the scales from his eyes, and, therefore, before he was baptized. If such were not the case, then what God intended by the visit of Ananias, and said himself should come to pass, did not take place accordingly. The design of the mission is thus expressed: "That thou mightest *receive thy sight*, and be *filled with the Holy Ghost*." Both of these objects were accomplished in the same moment of time. What light was to his natural eyes, that the Holy Ghost was to his soul. It follows that he had received the forgiveness of sins before he arose, and was baptized *standing up!*

If this reasoning should be regarded with doubt, or accepted with hesitation, we can, nevertheless, take the very system of those who would question its validity and prove positively that Saul received the forgiveness of all his sins before his baptism. They deny that any Christian man is authorized to pray for a single sinner in all the universe of God; yea, more—that any sinner has the right to pray for himself until after his sins are pardoned. But Jesus Christ did not send Ananias to Saul until he could say of the bloody bigot, for the encouragement of

the timid disciple, "Behold he *prayeth.*" Now, if no sinner can pray for himself, and yet if Saul of Tarsus did pray for himself, and was approved and commended by Jesus Christ for so doing, then Saul was not a sinner when he "prayed," but a saint by grace. This, by the way: But that Saul obtained the forgiveness of his sins in answer to his prayers, and, therefore, before his baptism, is made a certainty by one of his own great doctrinal statements on the subject: "For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is *rich unto all that call upon him.* For whosoever shall *call* upon the name of the Lord shall be *saved.*" (Rom. x. 12, 13.)

The language in Acts xxii. 16, "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," is not contradictory of any of the positions taken in reference to the case of this remarkable man. The phrase "wash away thy sins" is highly figurative. The simple meaning is, that as the outward application of water to the body is cleansing, so the inward operation of the Spirit of God upon the human heart is morally cleansing. One is an outward and bodily act, the other is inward and moral. One is physical, the other is spiritual. The one is a symbol, the other is a reality. A physical act, or any physical process whatsoever, never did bring moral purity since the world began, and God never ordained that it should. "Having our hearts *sprinkled from an evil conscience*, and our *bodies washed with pure water*" (Hebrews x. 22), is a divine exposition of the meaning of

the direction, "Be baptized and wash away thy sins."

What has been justly called the first period of the Christian Church has now been carefully gone over, and yet we have not found, though every case of conversion recorded therein has been carefully examined, a single "fact" "documenting," as it has been pompously called, the hyperbiblical supposition that baptism is essentially necessary in order to the remission of sins. This period begins with the Pentecost and extends to the resurrection of Dorcas, a period of about eight years. During all these years, however, notwithstanding the authority of the great commission, none but Jews heard the preaching of the gospel. No Gentile knew any thing of its ample and boundless provisions, or of the superlatively simple and easy terms upon which personal salvation might be expected and obtained through Jesus Christ. It is necessary, therefore, that we should now inquire whether the same system of doctrines was preached to the Gentiles that up to this date had been proclaimed, with such power and success, to the Jews.

4. In the tenth chapter of The Acts we have an account, in the case of Cornelius and his household, of the first conversions to Christianity from among the Gentiles. This Roman centurion was devout, charitable, and prayerful. On a certain occasion, while engaged in prayer, he saw, in a vision, an angel, who told him that his prayers and his alms had come up for a memorial before God, and that he should now send men to Joppa for one Simon, whose surname was Peter, and that "he should tell

him *what he ought to do.*" While two of his servants and one of his soldiers went for Peter, God, by a remarkable vision, instructed the latter not to refuse compliance with the request, but to go without "gainsaying." When he arrived at the house of Cornelius, a detailed account of all the extraordinary things that had therc recently taken place was given to him, and in answer to the question, "I ask for what intent ye have sent for me?" the centurion closed his remark by saying: "Now therefore we are all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God." After so frank an avowal, Peter opened his mouth and began: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that fearcth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." He continued his discourse upon the death, resurrection, and judgeship of Jesus Christ, and finally uttered these words: "To him [Jesus Christ] give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever BELIEVETH in him *shall receive remission of sins.*" Do not these words show most unequivocally the immediate and final condition upon which this Gentile and his family were to expect the remission of sins? But in the next verse we have a wonderful phenomenon: "While Peter yet spake these words (remission of sins through faith in Jesus Christ, witnessed both by the law and the prophets), the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word." In Acts xi. 15, Peter says, when defending himself before his brethren in Jerusalem for his conduct while among the Gentiles: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the

beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." From the time and circumstances under which this declaration was made, it is unquestionable that the words of Christ, alluded to, did not refer exclusively, as has been imagined, to the day of Pentecost, but have their meaning vindicated, and their fulfillment realized, instantly, in the experience of every soul converted to God. How, otherwise, could Peter have thought of the words of Christ as having any fitness to the occasion? for the Pentecost had gone by, eight years before. If he had been what some persons pretend he was, and had taught what they have alleged he did teach, he never could have "remembered," not even for a moment, such an utterance. Intent upon the salvation of souls, he seems never to have thought of baptism at all, until his Gentile auditors were already converted to God, and their hearts warming and burning with the fires of the Holy Ghost. He then turned to his six Jewish brethren, and said (plainly showing the ritual character of the ordinance), "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" The evidence of Gentile pardon was here so unequivocal and satisfactory, even the same, as Peter told his Jewish brethren, that had been given them of their own forgiveness on the day of Pentecost, that not a man found it in his heart to object a single word: "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." The simple "facts" are these: Peter as-

serted before his brethren in Jerusalem that an angel told Cornelius, in vision, to send for him, and that he should "tell him words *whereby he should be saved.*" When he arrived at the house of the devout Gentile, he preached remission of sins by faith in Christ, and summoned "all the prophets" as witnesses that the doctrine is true. While he preached, the great principle, so powerfully supported, took practical effect in the hearts of his hearers, and the Holy Ghost fell on them, as previously on the believing Jews at Pentecost. It is also remarkable that Peter only related the matter thus far at Jerusalem; he did not tell his brethren whether he baptized the believing Gentiles or not, and not one of them asked him the question; yet as soon as he closed his defense, they were fully satisfied, and declared with one voice, "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted *repentance unto life.*" How could Peter have acted on this occasion as he did, if he had before taught on the day of Pentecost what has been charged upon him? Did he act with duplicity, contradict himself, or open the kingdom of heaven to the Gentiles with the wrong key? The true answer is, He taught in the house of Cornelius the very same doctrines that he had proclaimed years before at Pentecost. On both occasions he preached repentance and faith for the remission of sins; for God "put *no difference* between" the Jews and Gentiles, "*purifying* their hearts *by* faith." (Acts xv. 9.)

5. A train of "facts," all substantiating the positions already taken, but which cannot be noticed so much in detail, are the following: When Elymas,

the sorcerer, attempted to turn away Sergius Paulus from the faith, Paul, by the power of the Holy Ghost, struck him with instant blindness. It is immediately added: "Then the deputy, when he saw what was done, *believed*, being astonished at the doctrine of the Lord." (Acts xiii. 12.) That faith in the Lord Jesus Christ was the immediate condition upon which this man experienced the forgiveness of his sins, is a fact clearly stated. It is not said that he was baptized, and, indeed, no allusion is made to the ordinance. After this, Paul and Barnabas departed to Antioch in Pisidia, "and went into the synagogue on the sabbath day and sat down. And after the reading of the law and prophets, the rulers of the synagogue sent unto them, saying, Ye men and brethren, if ye have any word of exhortation for the people, say on." Paul accepted the invitation, and preached a sermon very much resembling that of Stephen's, in the seventh of Acts, toward the close of which he used these remarkable words, in applying what he had just proclaimed: "Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man [Jesus Christ] is preached unto you the FORGIVENESS OF SINS: and by him *all that* BELIEVE are JUSTIFIED from ALL THINGS, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." (Acts xiii. 38, 39). "Justification from all things" is justification from the guilt and power of sin, by faith in Christ. Throughout the sermon, although it was a long one, and preached to a congregation entirely ignorant concerning the developments of Pentecost, Paul makes no mention of baptism for the remission of sins; yet many of them were pardoned, as

is evident from these words: "Now when the congregation was broken up, many of the Jews and religious proselytes followed Paul and Barnabas; who, speaking to them, persuaded them to *continue in the grace of God.*" (Verse 43). Men and women who have been brought into the "grace of God" are not in a dangerous state. But this is not all, for the Gentiles requested that this same sermon might be preached to them the next Sabbath. When the time came, the Jews [the unbelieving Jews], seeing the multitude, "were filled with envy, and spake against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming. Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold, and said, It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of *everlasting life*, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath God commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for *salvation* unto the ends of the earth. And when the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of the Lord: and as many as were ordained to *eternal life* BELIEVED." Every Gentile, therefore, whose purpose and aim were "fixed or settled" upon "eternal life" obtained it, and found "SALVATION" by faith in Christ; and every persecuting and blaspheming Jew missed "eternal life," and lost "salvation," by *not* "believing." Baptism is not named or alluded to in the history.

Every single recorded case has now been inquired into of persons professing the Christian faith, up to the close of the sixteenth year after the day of

Pentecost, and not one has been found in which the facts will justify the belief that baptism, as an indispensable condition, had any thing whatever to do in the remission of sins. Hence, the hypothesis that interprets our text, besides other scriptures in support of such a misconception, is, by the aggregate of all the facts that occurred in every case where the forgiveness of sins was obtained, for sixteen years after Peter said, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost," not true.

Paul, after he had returned to Antioch from a long tour of missionary work, during which he made known the conditions of pardon at Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, when giving an account of the matter, says concerning all these places: God "had opened the door of *faith* unto the Gentiles." (Acts xiv. 27.) If baptism holds so conspicuous and essential a relation to the remission of sins, as is pretended by some, why did not Paul observe the highest fitness of things, and say, "God hath opened the door of baptism to the Gentiles?" or the door of faith and baptism? And why, too, in the detailed accounts of what took place at these various cities, is baptism so important as never to be named at all?

Lydia and her household constitute a striking case: "And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. And when she was baptized, and her house-

hold, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there. And she constrained us." (Acts xvi. 14, 15.) Surely, a woman who worshiped God, and was therefore already converted and pious, and whose heart the Lord opened, that she might embrace Jesus as the promised Messiah, was not in a condition to be essentially benefited by baptism. But with this woman Christianity commenced in Europe. She was the first convert ever made upon that continent. Being, therefore, as it were, in a new world, cut off from the Orient by the breadth of the Mediterranean Sea, and among a people that had never heard of Jesus Christ, if baptism were for the remission of sins, Paul ought to have been emphatic and explicit in so declaring.

In the sixteenth chapter of Acts, we have a particular account of the conversion of the jailer at Philippi and his household. If ever baptism were instituted for the remission of sins, and if, practically, it ever had any value in that regard, it ought so to have appeared on the present occasion; for this jailer was a very wicked and cruel man. Receiving a charge, after Paul and Silas had been severely beaten with stripes, "to keep them safely," he "*thrust* them into the *inner* prison [the dungeon], and made their feet *fast in the stocks.*" They prayed and sang praises to God at midnight. An earthquake—a symbol of the Divine presence—shook the foundations of the prison, unbolted and threw open all its doors. The jailer, alarmed lest his prisoners had fled, was about to commit suicide, when Paul said, "Do thyself no harm: for we are all here."

Powerfully convicted of his sins, the poor man fell down at the feet of the apostles, and inquired, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" The answer is unmistakable: "BELIEVE on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou *shalt be* SAVED;" but he "was baptized, he and all his, straightway." And this proves that he was not ashamed to profess the religion of Christ openly, and thus identify himself, without unreasonable delay, with the little Church already existing in the house of Lydia.

There is a record, in Acts seventeenth, of the evangelic labors of Paul at three different places, and, although he was eminently successful at each, baptism is not named in a single instance. At Thessalonica the account is: "And some of them *believed*," of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few." (Verse 4.) At Berea, "Many of them *believed;* also of honourable women which were Greeks, and of men, not a few." (Verse 12.) At Athens, after preaching God's commandment that all men, everywhere, should repent, and after enforcing it by the terrors of a coming judgment, it is said: "And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, some mocked: and others said, We will hear thee again of this matter. So Paul departed from among them. Howbeit certain men clave unto him, and *believed:* among the which was Dionysius the Areopagite, and a woman named Damaris, and others with them." (Verses 32–34.)

Paul preached the gospel at Corinth, in Greece, "And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were bap-

tized." (Acts xviii. 8). In this instance, baptism was administered, but, just as in every other instance where mentioned at all, as an outward sign of an inward spiritual work.

That the twelve men at Ephesus, mentioned Acts xix. 1–7, did not obtain the remission of their sins by an "act of faith" in submitting to baptism, is evident from the fact that they were baptized over again; and even then it was necessary for Paul to lay his hands on them before they received the Holy Ghost.

Finally, whether the remission of sins is necessarily connected with baptism is definitively settled, so far as Paul is concerned, by his words to the elders of the Church at Ephesus: "And how I kept back NOTHING that was PROFITABLE unto you, but have shewed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, *repentance* toward God, and *faith* toward our Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts xx. 20, 21). He kept back "nothing" that was "profitable," and yet said nothing about baptism. How can we account for this, if baptism were one of the original and divinely-established conditions of the forgiveness of sins?

We have now, in our study of the inspired history, gotten thirty-one years beyond the day of Pentecost, and we have examined every instance of repentance, faith, and baptism, recorded during that period; but, instead of finding a single case supporting the dogma of baptism for remission of sins, "facts" have seemed more and more contradictory of such a notion, until Paul comes out and settles

the question forever, by declaring positively what he had ever preached as absolutely necessary to the forgiveness of the Jew, and the salvation of the Gentile: "REPENTANCE toward God, and FAITH toward our Lord Jesus Christ."

Baptism, as the third and last condition of pardon, supposed by some to have been authorized by Jesus Christ, and to have been preached by Peter on the day of Pentecost, is not only untrue—arguing, from the exposition of the text already given, the unquestionable connection existing between repentance and faith, on the one hand, and the forgiveness of sins, on the other, all the "facts" bearing on the subject, as reported by the Holy Ghost for thirty-one years after the day of Pentecost—but is also flatly contradicted, and directly opposed, by the following sayings of Jesus, facts of inspired history, and divine reasonings of the apostles.

1. "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink. He that BELIEVETH on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly [heart or soul] shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the SPIRIT, which they that *believe on him* should receive." (John vii. 37–39.) The reception of the "Spirit," whose fruits are "love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance" (Gal. v. 22, 23), is here connected with faith in Jesus Christ, and with nothing else.

2. Jesus administered a severe rebuke, on a certain occasion, to the carnal Jews who followed him only because of the loaves and fishes that multiplied

in his hands, to the feeding of thousands. Feeling forcibly the justness of his charges, they asked, "What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?" The answer is in these remarkable words: "This is the work of God [what God requires of you], that ye BELIEVE *on him whom he hath sent.*" (John. vi. 28, 29.) If this is not the whole truth in answer to the question here propounded, then the Lord Jesus, by omitting a part, gave these persons incorrect information—but he professed to answer directly and categorically.

3. Again, we have this solemn and awful statement, also made by Jesus himself to the Jews: "Ye shall *die in your sins:* for, if ye BELIEVE NOT that I am he, ye *shall die in your sins.*" (John. viii. 24.) These words have little or no significance at all, unless they mean that the men who *do believe* in Jesus Christ, trusting in him for present "redemption" (Col. i. 14), shall *not die in their sins.* But if faith in Jesus Christ can take a soul through death without sin, will not God take that soul to heaven?

4. St. Paul understood these declarations of the great Master just as we do, otherwise he could never have said, "And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should *believe a lie:* that they all might be *damned* who *believed not the truth,* but had pleasure in unrighteousness." (2 Thess. ii. 11, 12.) As in other places, so here faith is saving, unbelief is damning; because the one accepts, the other rejects, the Saviour, the only "name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."

5. That the remission of sins is altogether inde-

pendent of baptism, as a condition, is beyond all doubt, from these most forcible and powerful words: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as *received* him, to them gave he power to become the *sons* of God, even to them that BELIEVE ON HIS NAME: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but *of God.*" (John. i. 11–13.) Those who "receive" Christ—which is but another word for "believing on his name"—are instantly "BORN OF GOD," pardoned, regenerated, and, in virtue of their birth, become heirs of immortality. From this conclusion there is no escape.

6. "He that believeth on the Son *hath* [not in "grant," but now in possession] everlasting life: and he that *believeth not* the Son shall *not see life;* but the wrath of God abideth on him." (John iii. 36.) The same principle, as heretofore, is here asserted: The vital connection of faith and everlasting life, and the close and indissoluble connection existing between unbelief and the abiding wrath of God.

7. The entire Ephesian Church was converted to God on the principles here laid down, if Paul was divinely inspired thirty-two years after the day of Pentecost, when he wrote these words: "That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first *trusted* in Christ. In whom ye also *trusted*, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye *believed*, ye were *sealed* with that *Holy Spirit of promise*, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory. Wherefore I also, after I heard of your

faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints, cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers." (Eph. i: 12–16.) So far, therefore, as we can know or learn from this quotation, every man and woman in the Church at Ephesus was a Christian, without any reference to baptism as a condition of remission of sins. Indeed, the ordinance of baptism was but the emblem of that grandest work of God, wrought in their souls by the Holy Spirit. Hence, "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water [the emblem of grace by the Holy Spirit] by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." (Eph. v. 25–27.)

8. "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that *believeth;* to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." (Rom. i. 16.) To develop and illustrate this great fundamental proposition, the apostle wrote one entire Epistle, and that, too, the longest one that he ever indited. An elaborate discussion would be required to bring out and present clearly all his inspired reasonings; but nothing more can now be done than to call attention to a few exceedingly pointed and pertinent statements found in chapter x. 8–13: "What saith it? the word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy *heart:* that is, the word of *faith*, which we preach: that if thou shalt *confess* with thy *mouth* the Lord Jesus, and shalt BELIEVE in thine HEART that God hath raised him from

the dead, thou SHALT BE SAVED. For with the *heart* [the moral feelings of the soul] man *believeth* unto *righteousness* [justification]; and with the mouth *confession* is made unto *salvation*. For the Scripture saith, Whosoever *believeth* on him shall *not be ashamed*. For there is *no difference* between the Jew and the Greek: for the same Lord over all is *rich* unto all that *call upon him*. For whosoever shall *call* upon the name of Lord shall be *saved*."

9. God's purpose in the conversion and mission of St. Paul: "Unto whom [the Gentiles] now I send thee to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." (Acts xxvi. 17, 18.) The object of God was that the Gentiles "might *receive* the FORGIVENESS OF THEIR SINS:" to this end Paul was "to *open their eyes*, turn them *from darkness to light*, and *from the power of Satan unto God*." On what condition were they authorized to expect so great a benefaction from God? "By *faith* in Jesus Christ." No other immediate condition was needed. "By grace are ye saved through faith." In all his teachings, the apostle never deviated from these principles: "Were ye baptized in the name of Paul? I *thank* God that I baptized *none of you* but *Crispus* and *Gaius:* lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name. And I baptized also the *household of Stephanas;* besides, I know not whether I baptized any other." On what principle, consistent with the object of his mission, could he have assumed this prudential position, if baptism had been "for the

remission of sins?" But, was the course pursued merely a matter of prudence, and no more? Nay, verily, "for," he says, "Christ sent me NOT TO BAPTIZE, but to PREACH THE GOSPEL." The gospel, then, as the greatest apostle that ever lived understood it, and baptism, were two absolutely distinct things; otherwise, he could never have thanked God that he had been the instrument of pardon to but two men and one family.

10. If conversion, regeneration, and baptism, all mean one and the same thing—namely, "immersion into water," upon a mere profession of faith in Jesus as the Messiah of the prophets—then THE LORD JESUS CHRIST NEVER SAVED A SOUL WHILE HE WAS UPON EARTH, and the servant *is* above his Master; for "*Jesus himself* baptized *not*, but *his disciples*." (John iv. 2.) But Jesus did save *one sinner* at least, for when he became the "guest" of Zaccheus, a "man that *was* a sinner," he said: "This day is SALVATION come to *this house*, forasmuch as he also is a son of Abraham. For the Son of man is come to *seek* and to *save* that which was *lost*." (Luke xix. 9, 10.)

MINISTERIAL SUPPORT.*

BY THE REV. J. R. DEERING.

"Have we not power to eat and to drink? Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas? Or I only and Barnabas, have not we power to forbear working? Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? Say I these things as a man? or saith not the law the same also? For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes, no doubt, this is written: that he that plougheth should plough in hope; and that he that thresheth in hope should be partaker of his hope. If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? If others be partakers of this power over you, are not we rather? Nevertheless we have not used this power; but suffer all things, lest we should hinder the gospel of Christ. Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel."—1 Cor. ix. 4–14.

THE occasion that gave rise to this defense was this: For peculiar and personal reasons, growing out of the circumstances attending his ministry

* This subject was assigned the author by the compiler of

among the Gentiles, St. Paul had refrained from demanding his living of the Corinthian Church He had voluntarily relinquished his claim as a preacher in order to promote their welfare as a congregation. He had chosen to support himself at his trade of tent-making rather than be "burdensome" to his Gentile converts. As was customary in such cases, he "went forth, taking nothing from the heathen" (3 John 7)—at least, from those whom he had converted at Corinth. To them he "had made the gospel of Christ without charge." (1 Cor. ix. 18.) To them he had "preached the gospel of God freely, robbing other churches, taking wages of them, to do them service." (2 Cor. xi. 7, 8.) This greatest apostle had renounced all right to be supported by the Churches he had founded, lest some enemy should accuse him of preaching for money, and not for souls, and thus lessen the influence of his ministry, and hinder the cause of his Master. To state the case in his own language, he had "not used this power, lest he should hinder the gospel of Christ." (Verse 12.) St. Paul had

---

the volume. Had it been left to him, the writer would have chosen some other topic. On this point, Martin Luther's language expresses exactly his sentiments: "I do not love to expound such sentences which speak for us that are ministers of the word; moreover, it may look, if one is zealous to treat such texts before the people, as if he did it on account of avarice. But one must nevertheless instruct the people thereabout, that they may know what degree of honor and support they owe to their teachers. This is also good for us, that are in the ministry, to know, that we may not take our deserved recompense with uneasy conscience, and as if we had no right thereto."—J. R. D.

even "laboured, working with his own hands," that he might place his ministry above suspicion. (1 Cor. iv. 12.) More than that, "while present with them," he had been "in want"—*hustereetheis*—in *destitution;* yet "he was chargeable to no man; for that which was lacking to him the brethren which came from Macedonia supplied." (2 Cor. xi. 9.) It was a noble instance of self-denial on the part of one who gloried in suffering for Christ, and who boasted that he was "all things to all men, that he might by all means save some."

But this refusal to receive what he had earned by apostolic service was meanly construed by his enemies into a virtual admission that he was not a true apostle. The very means by which Paul had sought to avoid giving offense was basely converted into a cause of offense. Because this self-sacrificing man would not demand his pay, his opposers argued that he ought not to have any—that he was not a true minister of Christ. The apostle, in reply, wrote my text to assert his right, and vindicate his character. He calls it (verse 3) "mine answer to them that do examine me."

A trite saying is that "history repeats itself." It is verified in this matter. Many Methodist preachers have acted upon Paul's principles, and some Methodist members have imitated the Judaizers at Corinth. Our itinerant preachers have "gone about doing good," like their Divine Master, in the spirit of self-denial and sacrifice; like St. Paul, they have received what was given, but refused to demand what had been earned, lest some should make their "glorying void." "Even unto

this present hour they both hunger, and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no certain dwelling-place; and labor, working with their own hands"—never mentioning money when they can help it. This has been the case with our ministry so long, and so universally, that the true nature of their claim to support has been frequently forgotten, and sometimes even denied. Many have come to think that ministerial support is a thing of charity, and not a thing of justice; that ministers, like mendicants, are entitled to receive, but not to demand, their living; that a member may give to them, or withhold from them, according to his humor—always deserving praise for the one, but never incurring blame for the other! It is never denied that the Church ought to maintain the ministry, but it is often affirmed that the individual member may help, or refuse help, as he may please under the circumstances. The Church is under obligation: the member may exercise discretion! The Church is morally bound: the member is individually free! The ministry must be supported, but then somebody else must support it! This may not be very good logic, but it is very common reasoning. And many who would be ashamed of such a theory are not ashamed of their practice, which is in perfect accordance with it.

Against all such false doctrine and unreasonable practice the apostle here aims an irresistible blow. It is one of the most forcible and exhaustive arguments contained in Paul's writings; one that is seldom read, and scarcely ever discussed, in the pulpits of "the people called Methodists." Let

us take up these arguments, for a short study, *seriatim.*

I. NATURAL RIGHT. St. Paul puts the claim to ministerial support, first, on the ground of natural right: "*Have we not power to eat and to drink?*" This is such an obvious thing that I scarcely know how to go about showing it. It proves itself to every mind. I have called it the ground of natural right because it is perceived and accepted by nature. To allow and feel it is intuitive. No demonstration can make it plainer. The judgment is not called upon to consider the question. Consciousness admits the conclusion at once. "We [the ministry] have power to eat and to drink"—to live by our ministry; for that is the point under discussion. Note that here Paul uses the plural pronoun "we," by which he classes himself with his fellow-laborers, and speaks for them in every place and age of the world.

To understand the relation and work of the pastor is to concede his right to support. The title cannot be denied by one who has this knowledge. Labor creates a claim to compensation. This is as axiomatic as that "the whole is greater than its parts." No matter of what kind, or where bestowed, or for whom done, or by whom rendered, labor entitles the laborer to pay. On this natural and common-sense principle rests the demand of every worker in society. The carpenter, the doctor, the dress-maker, the stable-boy, and the minister-of-state, all base their claim, and receive their pay, on the ground of service rendered. Jesus promulgated this principle when he declared, "The laborer

is worthy of his hire." (Luke x. 7.) And Paul appropriates it to, and applies it for, the ministry when he asks, "Have we not power to eat and to drink?" There is no argument here, for none is needed. The appeal is to nature. The emphasis is on the "*we*." Have "*we*" not the right to live, as do others, by our own labor? The only point is to admit that the preacher labors. The moment this is done, the conclusion, that he has a right to be maintained, follows. I will not detain you to show that your pastor labors. It is too manifest; the word of God requires it; the oath of his office requires it. His earnest eye, his care-worn brow, his whole countenance and conduct, tell of toil; every habit and service was born of toil; toil is written on his books, and over his pulpit; the Sunday-school, and lecture-room, and pastoral round, proclaim how severely he studies, how ceaselessly he toils. Few lives are so laborious as a pastor's. His duties demand his whole time, absorb his whole mind, and engage his whole heart. To attend to them he gives up all other things, and becomes a "man of one work." Surely that work entitles him to wages.

II. UNIVERSAL USAGE. Having shown that the right is a natural one, Paul now shows that it is sanctioned by universal usage. As it is a common-sense principle, so it is commonly carried out. "*Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges?*" What soldier does not draw his pay, his rations, and his clothing? Who ever heard of a government, even in heathendom, that did not feed and clothe its own defenders? All nations do this. And more, they allow a share in the spoils of war, give boun-

ties to the families of volunteers, pay pensions to wounded and worn-out veterans, provide accommodations for them when sick, and bury them when slain. Governments that are proverbially ungrateful, that have neither soul nor conscience, that are irresponsible in time and in eternity—governments do all this! What would be thought of a congregation that should treat a soldier of Christ in like manner?

"*Who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof?* Where is the farmer who lives not on the corn and meat he raised with his own hands? And who is simple enough to question the right to do so? No one. Every man admits that he who works shall eat, and all the farmers and fruit-growers in the world live on the products of their fields and vineyards. So do the stock-raisers.

"*Who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock?*" Shall a man raise cows, and never drink milk? or fatten beef, and never eat steaks? or make shoes for others, and go bare-footed himself? or build houses, and live out of doors? or go around saving life, and die for want of the means of life? In other words, Shall a man do any thing for nothing? That is Paul's question. And the answer is in every man's mouth. No! Such is not the theory or practice of anybody. Every man, woman, and child that works receives pay. The usage is universal. The apostle names the soldier, the vine-grower, and the stock-raiser, in proof of a custom that obtains among all workers, everywhere. He cites these to show that, no matter what the avocation, the practice of men is the same. The ship-builder, the nail-maker, the school-master, the

strect-sweeper, the President, and the printers' "devil," all receive pay. To expect them to serve for nothing would be evidence of insanity. Then, why require preachers to work for nothing? why make exceptions of them? who gave you authority to distinguish them from all other workers? Do you not see that universal usage requires you to pay them? I say, *Pay* them; not give them alms, but pay them wages. The minister's service does not constitute him an "object of charity;" it renders him "worthy of hire." He earns not a right to your pity, but a part of your money. He may have many times more than you have, he may be very rich, and you very poor—that does not effect the case, that does not change the everlasting principles of right. He is not soliciting alms, but awaiting his dues. If he has worked for you, if he has preached to your family, visited your house, waited on your sick, or buried your dead; if he has used his brains, or invested his funds, or employed his time, to advance your interests, and save your soul—then, you owe him part of your living, though that living be only a "mite" altogether; and if you refuse him this, you treat him as you would not treat the negro who holds your horse. But this claim rests on yet higher ground.

III. DIVINE LAW. "*And is this the rule of man only, or is it not also the law of God? Yea, in the book of Moses's law it is written: Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn. Doth God take care for oxen? or saith he it altogether for our sakes? For our sakes no doubt this is written.*" Observe the advance here. Paul

assures us that he does not "say these things as a man," but that the Divine "law saith the same also." He founds his cause not on natural right, or on universal custom, only, but on Divine enactment also. He pleads his legal, as well as his natural, right in this matter. Here is the pastor's right, to demand his pay of each of his hearers, conferred not by the Legislature of Kentucky, but by the Sovereign Lord of heaven. Now, we may differ as to the propriety of enforcing this law by ecclesiastical pains and penalties, but it is impossible to differ in regard to the law itself; for mark, it is not an oral tradition—"it is *written*." Not written in the fathers, but "written in the *law*." Read Dent. xxv. 4.: "*Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn*." Even the beasts, "that want discourse of reason," are to have their food, and that without "muzzle"—without measure. This, then, is Heaven's law; and St. Paul declares that it was not enacted for the benefit of oxen, but "for our sakes altogether"—for us poor preachers, in particular. I declare to you that, at the first glance, this seems incredible, and I find it as hard to believe as the story of Samson's little foxes, yet, doubtless, it is true that God, the Almighty, has made a *law* that no faithful preacher of the gospel shall be denied his bread while he does his work. God is just, if men are not; and it is a comfort to know that we have such a law, even though it is not always carried out. As if he thought some one would seek to misconstrue or evade it, Paul immediately interprets and applies this law. He asserts, in the strongest form, that God is not

concerned for oxen, but has made this law on our account "altogether." He does not deny God's providence over the cattle, but he asserts the typical nature of the statute which was designed to establish the far higher right to support of all gospel teachers. It is remarkable that the claims of other workers are left to assert themselves in the human mind and conscience, whilst this of the gospel minister has been provided for from the beginning, and in the councils of the Trinity! Moreover, this most ancient and especial enactment has been construed, has had its meaning fixed, and its limit established, by the "opinion" of the greatest of inspired lawyers. Is not that remarkable? What shall we think, in the light of such facts, of those infinitesimal lawyers who deny its legality? Friends, there is no going back of this statute. There is no appeal from this "opinion." Here is the text, and it is authentic. Here is the construction, and it is authoritative. The claim is a debt—the court orders payment. The obligation is as binding as law can make it. You have as much right, in law, to cut your mother's throat at midnight as to repudiate your preacher's claim at quarter-day. One act would be more unnatural than the other, but not a whit more unlawful. The law of God allows murder just as clearly as it allows dishonesty. It was designed to protect the minister's family, as well as the mother's life. It may not be so bad to defraud one's pastor as to kill one's parent, but it is quite as unlawful. But if we would reach "to the height of this great argument," we must go on.

IV EXAMPLE OF THE JEWISH CHURCH. "*Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar?*" This text may be paraphrased thus: Do you not know that the priests—who were the preachers in the Jewish Church—that officiated in the temple always lived upon the tithes and first-fruits which were brought to the temple, and that those who served at the altar always shared with the altar every gift and offering that was made upon it? This was the Divine assessment plan as adopted and used in the Jewish Church from the days of Moses to the time of Christ. Some persons dislike "the assessment plan," and think it an innovation: they have read the Bible to little purpose. This plan of Church finance was in vogue during Aaron's ministry in the wilderness, and for fifteen centuries afterward; for proof of which see every inspired book from Exodus to Malachi. In truth, we read in Genesis, the most ancient writing in the world (xiv. 20), that Abraham paid "tithes of all," and that Jacob said (xxviii. 22), "I will surely give the tenth unto thee." Yes, the Jews were assessed, and assessed "the tithe" of all they raised, as you will see by consulting Lev. xxvii. 30–33; Num. xviii. 21–24; Deut. xiv. 22.

The Levites and priests received no inheritance of land among the other tribes and families of Israel (Num. xviii. 20), but in lieu thereof "*all the tenth in Israel*" (verse 21) was allowed them "for an inheritance, for their service which they serve in the tabernacle of the congregation." The tax

was not a quarter of a dollar then. It was the tenth of every man's income, of his cattle, sheep, kids, wheat, barley, oats, fruits, vegetables, oil, wine, and so on, down to the mint that grew by the garden-walk. All products of the field, all animals in the fold, all fruits upon the trees—indeed, all things that were raised—were tithed to support the Church.

Moreover, these Church-dues had to be taken *of the best.* It was not lawful, in those days, to pay God's minister in musty meal, or rotten wood, or frosted fruits, or skippered meat. God ordered that they should have the "best"—not a fair mixture of good and bad, but "all of the best." Hear the word: "All the best of the oil, and all the best of the wine, and of the wheat, the first-fruits of them which they shall offer unto the Lord, *them have I given thee*"—*i. e.*, Aaron. (Num. xviii. 12.) Why, even the first-born of the children, if males, belonged to the priest, and must be redeemed from him by the payment of five silver shekels. From the garden-herbs to the cradle darling, God put his tax on every thing.

Then think of the proportion of this tax—*one tenth!* Suppose that a board of stewards should assess such an amount! And why should they not? Was the support of Judaism more important than the support of Christianity? or can a Christian minister live on less than a Hebrew priest? or has he less right to maintain a house and rear a family? or is he less worthy of a living? or does he confer less benefit upon those who enjoy his ministry? Why, then, does one have so liberal, and the other

so meager, an allowance? I'll tell you why, my brethren: because Divine Goodness made the one, and human selfishness often makes the other. That is the reason, whether it be complimentary or not.

This assessment was not too heavy on the individual member. God, the God of wisdom and love, the God who never makes mistakes, who cannot deal unfairly, who knew exactly what each member was worth—he made it, and made it right. God never oppressed any man. A tenth! Why, no Church-member should complain at that. Pagans often gave the tenth, and more. The Phenicians, the Carthaginians, the Pelasgians—the heathen that know not the true God, that never heard of his Christ; the heathen that "sit in darkness and in the shadow of death;" the heathen for whom we translate the Holy Bible, and to whom we send the gospel missionary—they delight to give the tenth; whilst we,

> Whose souls are lighted
> With wisdom from on high,

refuse to pay the hundredth part to him who "giveth us life, and breath, and all things," and yet, on high thank God, with uplifted hands, that we "are not as other men are"—"*stingy!*"

Nor were the "tithes" the only provision made for the priests and Levites. The Church furnished them parsonages, with gardens, pastures, and fields attached, all conveniently located, and forever free from rent! The tithe may be called their "quarterage," besides which, as you will see from Num. xxxv., they had house and lot, meadow and field—shelter

and food for children and cattle. These homes embraced forty-eight cities, were located on both sides of the Jordan, and extended from Dan to Beer-sheba. (Jos. xxi. 41.) Not only were Jewish parsonages free from rent (some Christian parsonages are not), but their occupants had the right to sell them or dispose of them as they pleased. The home of the Hebrew priest was his, not for a time, or in trust, but in "*fee simple.*" The adjoining lands he could not sell or forfeit. The Church made them his forever. They were absolutely inalienable. (Lev. xxv. 34.)

So much for the salary and the parsonage. Now let us see what were the perquisites. Well, to the priests belonged "the *first-fruits*" *of all the land—i. e.*, orchards, vineyards, fields, etc. I need not read the ordinanees. You can see them in Ex. xxii. 29; Deut. xviii. 4; ete. Watson says (Dict. p. 399), "Every private person was obliged to bring his first-fruits to the temple." These first-fruits embraced the seven principal productions of Palestine—viz.: wheat, barley, grapes, figs, pomegranates, olives, and honey. (Deut. viii. 8.) The amount was not determined by law, but left to the individual's generosity. "Yet," says Maimonides, "it is implied that a sixtieth part is to be eonsecrated, and he who wishes to devote all the first-fruits of his field may do so." (Kit. Cyc. Bib. Lit., vol. 2, p. 18.) Besides these raw materials, the people also gave of the first things manufactured from them; such as flour, oil, wine, etc. (Deut. xxii. 29.) Not a loaf from the new harvest could be baked or eaten in a Jewish home, until God's minister had reeeived his share. (Lev. xxiii.

14.) And if none were near to take his portion, it was to be thrown into the fire. All the first-bearing of fruit-trees must be sent to the Levite and priest. (Lev. xix. 23.) Every first-born animal, clean or unclean, if a male, must be offered in the temple, or redeemed with its price from the hands of the priest, to whom it by law belonged. Unclean animals had to be bought back from the priest at his valuation, with one-fifth added, or be put to death. (Ex. xiii. 13.) In fact, the Almighty claimed the first-born in the human family, and demanded that his redemption price be paid to the priest. (Ex. xiii. 15.) Here, then, are five kinds of "first-fruits"—viz.: of the farm, of the manufactory, of the orchard, of the fold, and of the womb—that, in part, constituted the priestly perquisite under the Jewish economy.

In addition to these, the priests were at all times, as the text asserts, "*partakers with the altar.*" They shared almost every offering put upon it. The flesh of the sin-offering, trespass-offering, peace-offering, the sheaves of barley-harvest, the loaves of the wheat-harvest, the remnants of the meat-offerings, the show-bread, and the leper's oil, they always ate in the sanctuary. Five other offerings they could eat only in Jerusalem. Five others were due them only in the land of Israel. Five more were theirs within or without the land; these embraced all things due in restitution to strangers, all devoted things, all first fleeces, all Nazarite offerings, and all skins of burnt-offerings—a princely revenue. (Kitto, vol. iii., p. 576.)

Such, in brief, was the noble provision made by

he Jewish Church for the maintenance of her ministry. To meet this assessment, it is estimated that *every member of the Church paid one-fifth of his income!* What a convincing proof of their appreciation of the Divine service! It is an argument, too, that cannot be confuted or evaded. I know that this was done under a dispensation that has passed away—that these Jewish institutions are not binding upon Christians; still the case is exactly in point, being cited by an inspired writer to establish the right of ministerial support under the gospel dispensation. He shows our duty by the light of their example. And then the spirit of the law remains, even if its letter has become obsolete.

If Jews did all this, then, *a fortiori*, Christians ought to do much more.

V THE CLEAR COMMAND OF JESUS CHRIST. "*Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel.*" This is the appointment of the Supreme Head of the Church. You will find the ordinance in Matt. x. 10, and Luke x. 7. St. Matthew says: "Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves: for the workman is worthy of his meat." St. Luke adds: "And into whatsoever house ye enter, ... remain, eating and drinking such things as they give: for the laborer is worthy of his hire." Here the ancient right that was recognized and used under former dispensations is confirmed under the gospel by an express ordinance of the Lord himself. Jesus sent out his ministers without money, food, or extra clothing; not that he designed

them to be hungry, coatless, moneyless men, but that the Church should supply them such things whenever needed. This is the Divine plan to-day, however it may strike us. The Master might have adopted another, but he did not. He could have called angels to the work; they have no wives or little ones; they require neither food nor raiment. He might have sent only rich men into the vineyard; they could have worked without wages. Or Christ could have sustained his servants by miracles. At his bidding, ravens would have carried meat, morning and night, to every parsonage in the land —manna could have fallen at any place, and in any quantity. But such methods did not seem good to Omniscience. Nor would God permit his preachers to labor six days for their bread, and the seventh for his Church. The command was, "Go, and as ye go, preach"—not work, nor teach school, nor take boarders. Ministers are "separated unto the gospel" (Rom. i. 1), and ought never to "entangle themselves with the affairs of this life" (2 Tim. ii. 4). The Almighty intended his embassadors to be free from the absorbing cares, pressing demands, and multitudinous temptations, of secular business, in order that they might give their minds, souls, and bodies—their entire time and undivided energies—to the wondrous work of saving men. He desired them to be men of one work; and that they might be, he laid the whole obligation of support for their families upon their several congregations. This burden is the people's; ours is "that which comes upon us daily, the care of all the Churches." (1 Cor. xi. 28.)

To show yet clearer where this responsibility rests, let me quote a passage from the inspired Epistles: "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine." (1 Tim. v. 17.) Griesbach translates: "Be counted worthy of double reward." To this agree Conybeare and Howson: "*Timees* here seems (from the next verse) to imply the notion of reward." Dr. Bloomfield says: "*Timees* may denote both competent reward and suitable respect. And *diplees*, as the best expositors, ancient and modern, are agreed, is to be taken as put for *pollees*—*i. e.*, 'liberal stipend.' This sense of the word is here to be preferred to the one commonly assigned." (Bloom. Gr. Test., *in loc.*) These distinguished scholars all interpret the passage as teaching that faithful pastors are to receive a "competent support"—a "liberal stipend," a "double reward."

In another place Paul shows who must provide this *pollees timees*, this "double reward." "Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things." (Gal. vi. 6.) Riddle, Lange Com., *in loc.*, says: "In all good things"—"temporal possessions of every kind." "This is to be understood in its broadest sense: care for temporal support is included in it, but not exclusively intended: there is to be, according to the words, a sharing of all good things—that is, in a certain sense, a community of benefits: he 'that is taught,' is to give 'him that teacheth' a share in all his advantages." (Otto Schmoller, *in loc.*) This is the exact sense of Conybeare and Howson's trans-

lation: "Let him that is receiving instruction in the word, give to his instructor a share in all the good things which he possesses." This text states what the pastor shall have—"a share in all good things;" and it tells who shall furnish it—"him that is taught in the word." Verily, if this ordinance of Christ was enforced, and this precept of St. Paul practiced, in all the Churches, there would be no necessity, as there is no permission, for ministers to seek a support outside of their vocation. We could then answer joyfully, as did the disciples, the Master's question, "When I sent you without purse, and scrip, and shoes, lacked ye any thing? And they said, Nothing." (Luke xxii. 35.)

Thus I have passed rapidly over the ground occupied by Paul, and saved time for several arguments of another kind. These I make from an ecclesiastical, and not a scriptural, stand-point.

VI. *Our Church should support the ministry liberally, in order to keep the best talent in our pulpits.* It is not derogatory to the ministry to say that, frequently, a pastor's Church relations, and even his sacred orders, are made to depend on his pay. Would God it were not so! but so it is. Many useful men have been forced to leave the itinerant ministry for lack of support. The Church ought to open her eyes to this fact. There are pastors today in our Conference whose salaries are inadequate to meet their real wants—who are sorely perplexed to provide for their families, and educate their children! And these are men of pulpit power, men whose names are "household words." Now, suppose that their circumstances should become

known to other denominations, and large inducements should be offered for their services; suppose that the change of Church involved, in their opinion, no serious change of doctrine; would it be remarkable, or unprecedented, for them to leave us? I know what astonishment it would create; but would it, after all, be strange? Have not many done so? Put yourself in their places, and present your heart this alternative: Shall I preach to this people, who do not support me? or shall I preach to that people who will support me? Shall I change my field, and continue my work? or shall I abandon the cause to which I had devoted my life? Ah! my brethren, that is the light in which this question often presents itself, and the result ceases to surprise me, when I remember how much human nature there is in men. Mark, I did not raise the question, What *ought* a man thus situated to do? We all agree on that point. He ought to starve at some "rich man's gate," and be wafted to heaven, thanking God that he could be nothing but a Methodist! No, that is not the question. I raised the question, What *will* he do? Ask history; ask humanity; ask your own soul, as you gaze upon the dear faces that bear your image, as you look into the tender eyes of her you promised to comfort and keep whilst life lasts! It is a painful question, my friends, when it comes thus to our own heart and home.

Our Church—it is notorious—has supplied, to a large extent, the pulpits of a sister denomination. Our preachers have gone by scores to her altars. She is not to blame for it. The fault is, partly at least, our own—we having laid our ministry

open to her offers by not giving them a competent support. I am satisfied that many have gone from our ranks in hope of larger rations. It is all very well for men who never saw the wolf at their own doors to swell out with indignation, and cry that preachers ought to be above such considerations, and that we want no man among us who preaches for money! I have no objection to that. Indeed, I say it myself with all my heart; every minister in the Connection will subscribe to that. But let me put this question: Ought the Church to place a faithful pastor in such a predicament? ought she to allow a faithless one such an excuse? It will not be denied that we do this. I know men who are struggling along on a thousand a year that could, without any step that would involve their salvation, next year get three, or five. These men are not in the market, but there is always a market demand for them. Now, what ought to be done? Should pastors perpetually be called upon to resist the temptation to take better salaries, and live in comfort, or should the Church generously remove the temptation by affording them the support they have honestly earned? "That is the question."

And suppose that this cause had never driven a good man into another Church; it cannot be doubted that it has sent hundreds into other pursuits. I venture the assertion that the want of support has retired more Methodist preachers than all other causes combined! It has shed more sorrowful tears, wrung more unavailing cries, broken more devoted hearts, and filled, prematurely, more preachers' graves, than those who are responsible for

it will ever know or imagine. For this, many have resigned a work dearer to them than life, and gone to seek their bread at more remunerative, if less congenial, toil.

But inadequate support not only decimates our ranks, it discourages enlistments; it not only puts men out of the itinerancy, it prevents them from coming in. My observation is limited, yet I have known men, not a few, called of God to preach, and anxious to do it, that were kept silent on this account—this alone. They are in banks, in schools, in the practice of law and medicine, earning the living that they had rather make in the gospel ministry. Commissioned by Christ, they are silenced by the Church! Brethren, what will it avail to "pray the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth laborers into the harvest," whilst we refuse to let those work whom he has sent? Think you he will call others, when you are shutting out those he has already called? Had we not better *pay* more, and then *pray* more?

But to return to the point—the leaving of our pulpits by gifted men. To allow such ministers to go into other communions argues, to many minds, a want of appreciation of them, which can arise only from a lack of adaptation, on the part of these ministers, to our work. It will never be said that our Church is too poor to pay them handsomely, but that, to us, they were worth no more than they got; in other words, that we had no suitable work for such men—no work such as is furnished by rival denominations. It will be said that our Church lacks the intelligence and refinement that

appreciate and pay first-class talent. This has been alleged in high places and low. It may, or may not, be true; I did not raise the point for discussion. I alluded to it as a fact. Men will argue thus, and with effect, upon the outside world. They cannot help supposing that a gifted minister is worth as much in one Church as another, if there is an equal demand for talent, and that he will receive as much; that when such a man changes his Church for other than doctrinal differences, it is for greater pay, which, to most men, means for greater appreciation. Every educated man that leaves us carries away with him, in the world's opinion at least, a part of our reputation for love of learning and ability. Men will think that we have no places for them, no work suitable for such workmen. We may assign other reasons for the turning of these wandering stars into different ecclesiastical orbits; the world will assign this one. And such a verdict we cannot afford. We must show as good a place for, and as high an appreciation of, gifted and educated ministers as can be found in any communion in this broad and enlightened land. Let us do this in vindication of a system that was born in the eldest of English universities, and that has never been for a moment without ministers of highest talent and broadest culture.

VII. *Ministers should be liberally supported, in order that they may better serve the Church.* It would require an hour to elaborate this thought, whereas I can give to it but a minute. There is a wonderful connection subsisting between body, mind, and estate. The mind affects the body, and both the

body and estate act upon the mind. A man can no more rise above the reach of the influence of his condition, temporal and physical, than he can jump beyond the bounds of nature's "universal law." I know what faith, and hope, and energy, and enthusiasm, can do when brought to bear, in their divine power, upon the human soul, and I know that they cannot make it independent of its earthly tabernacle, nor of its earthly surroundings. They find man on earth, and they leave him on earth, the very dust from whence he sprung. Religion may lift a preacher to the third heaven, but it cannot exempt him from the "thorn in the flesh." The same chapter that speaks of those visions in paradise tells of those miseries that the inspired seer was subject to. Man is as truly affected by his surroundings as a plant is by the light, or a butterfly by the heat. They may be barred out, temporarily, by the power of prayer, or by the force of lordly will, but they will never quit the tenant until the tenant quits this world. To illustrate: When a man is sick at his stomach, he cannot be well at his head; when he is afflicted in his estate, he cannot be comfortable at his heart. I mean, of course, permanently. A splinter in his finger, a mote in his eye, is sufficient to make him miserable in mind. Now, if such trifling physical causes can so affect the body and mind, how much greater must be the influence of professional, social, and domestic surroundings upon both mind and heart? That these affect the man, and all the man's work, is too well known to be discussed. I desire no more than to state, and insist upon, the fact—so generally forgotten—that

preachers are not exceptions to this universal rule. They are subject to the same hinderances, discouragements, and disasters, growing out of these things, as other men; and such is the nature of their work that the damage arising from unfavorable surroundings is incomparably greater with them than with other men. It shows itself more sadly in all their work. To do his best work, a minister's faculties must play harmoniously. His mind must be free, his heart light, and his body sound. I mean, simply, that he must have favorable circumstances, mental, moral, social, domestic; which is no harder to see than that to run well a steamer must have good fuel, good water, good weather, etc. How can a minister do his best without a comfortable table, a decent wardrobe, a cheerful home, a well-filled library, and a merry heart? And how can he get these things without a liberal salary? A man can hoe cabbage in almost any state of mind, but he cannot preach well. The mind and heart have little to do in wood-chopping, but they have all to do in sermonizing. Let me ask, Would it be natural to expect one of his best sermons on Sunday, when the pastor's heart had been heavy all week on account of debts unpaid, and wants unsupplied? What kind of a man must he be who could maintain a happy heart, and go from the sick-bed of his devoted wife, and preach an inspiring, eloquent sermon to the people who were withholding the money repuisite to buy the medicine necessary to restore that wife? How could a man do justice to himself, or to his Master, in the pulpit, who had not money to bury the dear dead infant that lay covered with

flowers in the village parsonage? And think you that a pastor could make a pleasant visit on the same day that his family was fasting for want of what your unpaid quarterage would have bought them. Such a minister would be rarer than such circumstances.

To do his best, *a preacher must have all his time for one work.* There is a notion, not confined altogether to illiterate people, that a minister works only about three hours a week, or, at most, but one day in seven! If such persons felt any special interest in their pastor, it would be cruel to undeceive them—the fact being so very different. Instead of working one day, and resting six, as many suppose he does, the faithful pastor generally works the entire week, resting not at all! He works whilst his people work, and then works whilst they are resting! What most Church-members look upon as their pastor's works—viz.: his efforts in the pulpit—are, in fact, only the results of his labors. The preaching of a sermon, when done as it should be, is no child's play, but, still, is very far from being so laborious as is the preparation of it. To see the real work, you must go to the study. You must take your stand there when the sun is coming through the gates of the east, and wait until he has gone round the world, and is nearly ready to come again. You must watch every weary, painful process of thought and investigation, from the laying bare of the crudest ideas that are stored away under the roots of inspired words to the moment when the sames ideas, tried, accepted, finished, and polished, are ready to be laid, like blocks of granite in the

structure of truth, for the admiration and service of all. You must weigh his authorities, scrutinize his translations, search his concordances, compare his chronologies, plod through his histories; in short, you must know all his uncertainties, doubts, responsibilities, and fears; you must see his tears of weakness, and hear his groans in prayer, before you can tell how much the sermon that delighted you has cost him. Yes, the minister must study; and so wide is the range of his thought, so manifold are the demands of his position, that he must have much time for it. His life must be given to it; he must be acquainted with art, science, language, literature; he must know history, theology, humanity, divinity. But how can he acquire this knowledge if he be forced to eke out his living by trading horses, insuring lives, teaching school, or writing for magazines or newspapers? How can he divide his time between the Church and the world, without slighting his work, or destroying his life?

To do his best, *the minister must have books.* These are as necessary to him as timber is to the carpenter, as the hammer is to the blacksmith. Nor are books few or cheap. They are flowing from the press in a ceaseless stream to supply the insatiable thirst of the people. The preacher must have them by the hundreds, but they cost money—*ergo*, he must have money.

And he *must have recreation.* He cannot work incessantly, any more than a horse or a locomotive. The birds are not always singing, the winds are not always blowing. Nature has her rests, and a minister must have his. He must rest, or die; nor can he rest,

always, in a single night, as do other men. Morning frequently finds him more weary and unstrung than when he dropped his pen, or pronounced his benediction. The exhaustion that follows brain work is not cured so quickly, nor so cheaply, as that produced by plowing. Brain tissue is not repaired like muscular. It takes weeks—sometimes months—to restore an over-worked mind. The minister must shut his books, leave his Church, and climb the mountains, or cross the ocean, to regain his wonted powers. But he cannot leave town without money, even on a half-fare ticket—*ergo*, he must have money. I know that all this is unpopular, and will be condemned by ignorant men, but I am appointed to preach not what shall be popular, but what is true. I know that such treatment is expensive, and upon some men would be worse than thrown away, but in the case of a hard-working pastor none is so cheap, so necessary, so life-giving. Promoting good health, it pays for itself in good work.

Now, if these things are so, is it not true that many congregations are acting not only with the grossest inconsistency, but also in a manner the very reverse of that demanded by their highest interests? Are not many Churches expecting to reap where they have not sown? Do they not clamor for the best of preaching, and yet deny the very means of culture and improvement? Do not their delegates importune the bishops for pulpit power and pastoral influence, and yet refuse the conditions necessary to produce them? Does not self-interest combine with common honesty to rebuke such a

policy, and to demand a competent support for every man that is doing honest work?

VIII. *This claim ought to be paid because of its unique character—it is not good in law.* God's law allows it, but civil law does not know it. It is binding in the court of conscience, or honor, but not elsewhere. Of all claims for service rendered, this is the only one that is not collectable by law. In the contract, if it may be so called, between our ministry and the laity, there are no writings, no signatures, no seals. A simple memorandum made of the allowance at the beginning of the year, and a bare statement of the amount paid at the end of the year, is all there is of the form or obligation, so far as this world goes. We do not even say, as do other men, for what amount we will work! The pastor's claim is not fixed by himself or his agent; it is "estimated by those who are to pay it, or by an agent authorized to act for them." (Dis., ch. ix. sec. 1.) This agent—the board of stewards—considers the question, and allows what *it* pleases, and on this allowance the members pay what *they* please! The pastor receives the amount, much or little, and, pleased or displeased, goes his way. This is "the conclusion of the whole matter." Nothing more can be said or done. Officers of the law can collect from the pastor whatever he owes, but they cannot collect for him one dime of his Church's indebtedness. The reading out of his name for another appointment is the canceling of his claim against the congregation that he last served. In this way our bishops pay off, annually, more Church debts than the defaulting congrega-

tions have ever given them credit for. The Discipline declares (ch. ix., sec. v.), "In no case shall the board of finance allow any preacher to have a claim on the Church he has served, as of debt, after his pastoral connection has ceased." Now, the traveling elders made that law, thus throwing themselves and their families upon the honor and conscience of the laity; thus appealing to the magnanimity of the membership of the Church for a generous support. The man, therefore, that would take advantage of such legislation to defraud his confiding pastor, being too base to profit by our remarks, is hereby recommended to the justice of One who "shall render to all their dues."

Such is our law, and its intent, at least, was good. It was not enacted to encourage repudiation, but to prevent complication of claims—to preclude the accumulation of debts that would never be paid. Under this law all pastors work, and although many sustain losses that are almost ruinous, doubtless it is the best. I would not change it to make it good in law. The member that would not pay a debt of honor, would not pay one of any kind. He that would repudiate a moral obligation, would find some way of evading even a legal process.

IX. *To support the ministry is to make the best possible investment of money.* In sustaining our pastors, we are sustaining the Church; and to do that, is to do the best for ourselves, our families, and our race. "Faith cometh by hearing: how then shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach, except they be sent?"

And—I must add—how shall they be sent, except they be paid? (Rom. x. 14, 15.) If, as Paul in this Epistle shows, salvation depends upon faith, and faith depends upon hearing, and hearing upon preaching, and preaching upon sending, and sending upon paying (as already proved), then does not salvation depend upon paying? Is not the logical chain unbroken? and the last link as necessary as the first? If salvation is conditioned upon hearing the gospel, and hearing the gospel is conditioned upon its being preached, and if this, in turn, depends upon some one supporting the preacher, then it is demonstrated that our salvation is inseparably connected with the support of the ministry. Of course it is! Paying is a means of grace as indispensable as praying. The gospel is not free to any man. Somebody has to pay for every sermon and service. I do not say, my brother, that *you* pay for them, but some one does. The bill is footed either by the contributions of the hearers to the preacher or by the contribution of the preacher to the hearers. They pay for the gospel in money, or he pays for it in toil. No one gets the gospel *gratis*, though thousands get it for nothing—they sponge for it. They make their neighbors, who are more liberal if not more able, pay for it. When this cannot be done, the pastor is forced to work out the cost of it in some secular calling, or to donate it from his own hard earnings, or to save it by yet harder self-denials! It costs every preacher so much annually to live and labor; if the Church does not pay that amount, it must come out of other pockets—often, it comes out of a woman's! Yes, be it known that the

message of salvation that falls so sweetly every Sunday on your ears is the result of some one's liberality, or some one's self-denial, in your behalf. It costs somebody, if not you.

To return: not only is paying the preacher a good investment of money on account of salvation, but also on account of the blessings it brings in this world. There is scarcely a good thing on earth that we do not owe to the gospel ministry! The Church laid the foundations of civil law, social order, free government, and religious liberty. It is she that holds men upon these foundations. Under God, the Church has taught the principles and imparted the power that binds the world together. Destroy this power, stop the advocacy of these principles in the pulpits of Christendom, and man would sink down in superstition—society would turn back into chaos. Silence the pulpit, and who would keep the Sabbath? or study the Scriptures? or pay his debts? or regard his oath? or restrain his passions? or respect his neighbor's rights? That our property is safe, that our fire-side is sacred, that our wives are our own and not another's, that our children are Christians and not gypsies—to what do we owe these things? To the Church and the ministry. They have made the moral sense, that made the civil law, that makes all these things so. The Church has civilized us. She is doing more to-day to protect and bless society than all the lawyers, and courts, and congresses, and armies, and navies on earth; and for a thousandth part of the money. She is sustaining the government, enforcing the laws, removing ignorance, abating crime, supplying

destitution, spreading truth, and flooding the world with "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." What better investment of money can there be than to sustain her? To sustain her is to uphold every good institution among men; to let her fall would be, eventually, to throw them all to the ground.

X. *The ministry should be liberally supported in order to obtain the blessing of God, and a revival of religion.* Some persons imagine that there is no sort of connection between paying the preacher and enjoying religion. In their minds, no two ideas are farther apart, or less related. In fact, there is positive antagonism between them, so that when they are engaged in singing the sweet songs of Zion, they are unable to see a collection-basket, though it passes right under their noses; and if called upon to pay the presiding elder, it quite unfits them for the communion service. Some think this collection should come after the sacrament, but the majority are of opinion that it should not come at all. It is *so* inappropriate, you know. Well, it is remarkable, in view of this very strong prejudice against mixing up spiritual and financial matters, that in the Bible the two subjects are connected, and one is made the condition of the other! Take an instance from real life, as recorded in Mal. iii. 8–12—God is talking to his people, "the sons of Jacob:" "Return unto me and I will return unto you, saith the Lord of hosts. But ye said, Wherein shall we return? Will a man rob God? Yet ye have robbed me. But ye say, Wherein have we robbed thee? In tithes and offerings. Ye are cursed with a curse: for ye have rob-

bed me, even this whole nation." Here is their sin and their punishment. They had "robbed" God in withholding "tithes"—in refusing to pay his ministers; for this the Almighty "cursed" them. I know delinquent Churches that cannot bear a reproof from the pulpit on this subject; Israel had to submit to the curses of an angry God. Jehovah did not suffer such robbery in silence. He cursed their cities, their fields, their baskets, their stores, their bodies, their cattle, their flocks, their coming in, and their going out; he cursed them with all kinds of curses. (Deut. xxviii. 15.) "For what?" For not paying the preachers! And here is what he required them to do: "Bring ye all the tithes into the storehouse, that there may be meat in my house, and prove me now herewith, saith the Lord of hosts, if I will not open you the windows of heaven and pour you out (Hebrew is *empty out*) a blessing, that there shall not be room enough to receive it." They must "bring tithes into the storehouse;" they must prove God "herewith" (not with songs or prayers, but with money); and the promise is that he will empty out on them blessings too copious to be contained. See! The pouring down of Heaven's blessings is conditioned upon the filling up of the minister's store-room. Zion's prosperity is made to depend upon Zion's liberality. It has always been so—God "curses" the Church that "robs" him.

The Almighty says: "Thou shalt not defraud thy neighbor, neither rob him: the wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning." (Lev. xix. 13.) How must he feel

toward those who *never* pay the wages of the hired man who stands in the pulpit? If "the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth, and the cries of them which have reaped have entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth" (James v. 4), how much more shall the cries of destitute pastors, helpless widows, and orphan children, enter into his ears, and bring down upon dishonest Churches his deserved judgments? They will as certainly do so as that God will prosper those who support his worship.

On this point, take one promise from a thousand: "Honor the Lord with thy substance"—*not with thy lips*—"and with the first-fruits of all thine increase: so shall thy barns be filled with plenty, and thy presses shall burst out with new wine." (Prov. iii. 9, 10.) Such conduct brings blessings upon our barns, as well as upon our hearts; indeed, upon all we have. See 2 Cor. ix. 8.

I am not now explaining a doctrine, but stating a fact. I do not assert the province of faith, or speak of the merit of works. I simply show that these two things, so generally regarded as foreign and hostile, are, in fact, near of kin, and, in Scripture, always connected. Giving and receiving go hand in hand. And "what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." These are as necessarily united as cause and effect. Nay more, the latter not only follows the former, but is always in direct proportion to it. The amount we give determines the amount we shall receive. "Give and it shall be given unto you: good measure, pressed down, shaken together,

and running over, shall men give into your bosom *For with the same measure that ye mete it shall be measured to you again.*" (Luke vi. 38.) Mark, this is not spoken concerning buying and selling, but of giving and receiving. To this principle Paul agrees: "He that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly: and he that soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully." (2 Cor. ix. 6.) Now, brethren, this is Scripture truth, New Testament truth, the inspired truth of God; and there is much more of the same sort, but I cannot quote it now. My point is made, and my task done. I cannot cite examples of the principle, or give the philosophy of it. It is enough to say that *alms* (as well as prayers), "go up for a memorial before God" (Acts x. 4), and that whatever God may despise, neglect, or forget in this world, or in the world to come, we have his assurance that he "is not unrighteous to forget your work and labor of love, which ye have showed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints, and do minister." (Heb. vi. 10.)

God grant that my readers may realize this gracious word in the day when God shall judge the world by Jesus Christ!

God grant that my Church—the Church in which I was born, to which I have devoted my life, and in which I expect to meet my death—may follow the example of "the Churches of Galatia"—may have the wisdom and courage to enforce on every congregation the simple, equal, scriptural plan of beneficence recommended by Paul—viz.: "Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him." (1 Cor.

xvi. 2.) Let her adopt *this time*—"*the first day of the week*"—and the amount will be comparatively small, yet the demand constantly supplied. Let her collect from *this number*—from "*every one of you*"—and the aggregate will be ample, and always ready for distribution. Let her enforce *this method*—each member "*laying by him in store*"—and there will be an end of wearisome collections in public. And let her insist on *this measure*—"*as God hath prospered him*"—and the Methodist Church, "the Church of the present," will be the Church of the future, and of all time to come. She will raise up more preachers, endow more colleges and universities, print more books, build more Churches, send out more missionaries, and Christianize more heathen in the next decade, than she has in the past century of her existence. Let her put this impartial plan in operation throughout her tens of thousands of circuits and stations, as Rome has done it, and Rome's cathedrals will crumble, and her children be "turned from idols to serve the living and true God." Let our Church do this—"Remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive" (Acts xx. 35)—and she need not blush to read of "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ that, though he was rich, yet for her sake he became poor, that she through his poverty might be rich" (2 Cor. viii. 9), nor will "God be ashamed to be called her God." (Heb. xi. 16.)

Finally, brethren, "TAKE HEED TO YOURSELVES THAT YOU FORSAKE NOT THE LEVITE AS LONG AS YOU LIVE UPON THE EARTH!" (Deut. xii. 19.)

SCIENCE AND CHRISTIANITY.

BY THE REV. T. J. DODD, D.D.

"Speak to the earth and it shall teach thee."—Job xii. 8.

THE Bible is not the only source of our knowledge of God. Hence, many of the nations have enjoyed much of this knowledge without the Bible. "That which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath revealed it unto them. The invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made—even his eternal power and Godhead." "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handiwork. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language, where their voice is not heard." "Ask now the beasts, and they shall teach thee; and the fowls of the air, and they shall tell thee: or speak to the earth, and it shall teach thee; and the fishes of the sea shall declare unto thee."

The entire universe is thus represented as proclaiming the being and the attributes of Deity. In two ways, then, has God spoken to the world a knowledge of himself—in nature and in revelation. Correctly interpreted, the two volumes are of equal authority, and neither can be perfectly compre-

hended without the assistance of the other. Nature had, to a great extent, remained a sealed book—her vast treasures of thought and knowledge of but little avail to the world—had not the seal been broken, and the volume opened, by the Spirit itself speaking more plainly to mankind of God. Or, the book may have been opened from the first, and every record spread before the world, yet, without the light reflected from the word, men had wearied themselves in vain to read their teachings—just as along the Nile venerable ruins had, for ages, proclaimed the history of the past, but the record no one could read, until the inscriptions upon the Rosetta stone had furnished the key to their long hidden meaning. Throughout the world are found the records of our God. They are written upon the *strata* of the earth; upon the buried fossils of extinct races; upon the ripple-marks of primeval seas, whose waves were hushed in a long-forgotten past; and upon vale and hill-top, and running stream and wide, expanded ocean, and starry concave bespangled with its worlds of glory; and throughout the universe has sounded the voice of God since first the morning stars rejoiced—sounded through the groves, his "earliest temples;" through the cataract and the storm; through the deep chorus of the seas, and the music of the spheres; yet, for the most of men, God had been still unknown but for the record and the voice of the eternal world.

And so is there much in Scripture that we can really apprehend only as viewed in the light of nature's teachings. Stated in the abstract, the grandest revelations had made but little impression upon

the mind. They had certainly not been realized in all that fullness of significance, with all the majesty and glory, or the pathos and beauty, with which many of them now appear invested, had not the sacred writers presented them in connection with so many grand and beautiful things in the natural world.

It may be said that scarcely an object exists, or an event transpires, which does not, when carefully considered by the mind in its suggestive moods, throw some light upon the revelations of Scripture. Study the trees and the birds, the flowers, lakes, rivers, oceans, mountains, plains—keep the mind open to the influences of the universe, as she speaks to "him who holds communion with her visible forms"—and it will be found that all her "varied language" is but an echo of the words of Him who spake as never man spake; that the seen is only the outward representation of the unseen; the finite, the physical, the earthly, announcing the infinite, the spiritual, the heavenly—man and his dwelling-place pointing upward to God in his glory.

If, then, nature yields so rich a field of illustration for the truths of Scripture, how essential that we reverently cultivate the science of nature. There can be no more inspiring or soul-exalting study than that which devotes itself to the contemplation of the laws and phenomena of the physical universe; for every law is but the will of God in action, and each phenomenon a visible form, or embodiment, of his power and wisdom.

He, therefore, who is most conversant with the forms of nature—who oftenest walks among the

groves, or by the ocean shore; listens to the breeze at evening; yields to the inspiring grandeur of the lightning and the storm; explores the caverns of the earth, or lifts his eye far-reaching to the worlds of light—will always, other things being equal, know most of God, holding sweetest converse with his presence, and bowing before his throne in humblest, truest adoration.

In other words, science is the clearest and most reliable interpreter of the word of God. And no man may expect to attain the fullest possible comprehension either of the character of God or of his dealings with the world, who does not appreciate those grand revelations he has given of himself in the works of his hands. Hence science and religion bear to each other the most intimate relations. In a modified sense they have the same origin, and, properly understood, they have the same mission in the world. Their mission is to lead us on our way through earth—from ignorance and sin to the knowledge of the truth, and the love of God. If we but listen to their voices, and understand their calls aright, they will conduct us along different paths at times, yet both directed, and eventually both converging, to the same great end, the same grand temple consecrated to truth and to God.

But some would sever this intimate and friendly relation, arraying science and religion in irreconcilable conflict. There are men of science who explore the labyrinths of nature only for weapons to assault the Christian's faith, and there are Christians who oppose each new fact or claim of science as but an agency whereby their hopes are to be extin-

guished, their God dishonored, and the entire world enveloped in the darkness and despair of an atheistic creed.

We propose to consider, briefly as possible, the leading relations of science and religion—their antagonisms and their agreements. For several reasons, we should prefer a discussion of some of the more essential elements of Christian truth, yet we regard that at the present time few topics could have been assigned us of more immediate or more practical bearing upon the great *general truths* of revealed religion than that to which we now invite attention.

The question naturally arises, How came it ever to be considered that science and revelation are each other's foes? whence the hostile attitude in which many have imagined them to stand? The question takes us back to the first dawn of scientific truth—at least, to the era whence begins that long array of brilliant discoveries which make up what we call modern science. Prior to such era, the religious faith of mankind was based upon belief in a Deity who directly, and without any secondary agencies, controls the universe; and each phenomenon of nature was regarded as occasioned by the immediate personal exercise of almighty power. When, therefore, from the observance of nature's uniformity, the conception of *general law* was first introduced, the great heart of the world was shocked, as if it were designed to depose God from his sovereignty, or at least cause him to retire into the remoter realms of his empire. The believer in religion thus came to regard the scientist with a

jealous suspicion. Every revelation of the physical world he considered a contradiction of the revelations God had given concerning the spiritual, and he felt that if science should be allowed to make farther researches into the kingdom of nature, the result would be, inevitably, the undermining of the foundations of his faith. Hence arose a spirit of intolerance, not unmixed with actual persecution, on the part of the Church, and, as a natural consequence, a feeling of resentment and retaliation with those who devoted themselves to science. Though, in later days, these feelings have considerably abated, so that the largest scientific and theological attainments are often united in the same individual, yet, with some, the animosity is still cherished in all its original intensity, and there are not a few who will admit no reconciliation.

Add to this the disposition on the part of scientists, which, however, they only share with the rest of mankind, to free themselves from responsibility, and seek justification in disbelief of things supernatural and divine. It really looks as if many scientists had previously made up their minds to object to revelation. Instead of seeking only the truth, they have sought confirmation of preëstablished opinions; instead of bringing their treasures of learning, like the wise men of the East, offerings to Him who is emphatically the *Truth*, they have employed them to seduce the world from every principle of a correct faith. No department either of physics or of metaphysics have they overlooked in the attempt to prove revealed religion a delusion. The entire field of history has been explored, if

haply they might find some fact or theory whose variance with the statements of the Bible may throw discredit upon its teachings as the word of God. They have searched the archives of nations buried long ago, and deciphered the hieroglyphics on broken shafts and time-worn monuments, to discover that Moses did not write the Pentateuch; they have examined the bones of animals extinct for cycles of centuries, to prove that he gives us no true account of creation; they have digged into the granite mountains, have turned up the rich alluvium of the valleys, broken through the rock formations of the earth, searched the realms of the upper, as well as the lower, deep; they have left untried no resource whatever, that they might extinguish the light of the world, and leave mankind to grope their way in darkness to the tomb.

But we would not lay emphasis on this disposition of the scientist. We inquire only into the natural causes that have set science and religion at variance. And here, with becoming modesty, we would note a misconception, both of the real objects of revelation and of the true nature of science, on the part both of believers and of opposers of religion. Many seem to regard science as something gotten up and forced upon the world for the purpose of weakening the general religious faith, and casting derision upon every thing sacred or divine. They also appear to lose sight of the fact that revelation makes no pretension to teach us scientific truth, its only object being to instruct mankind in the great truths of the spiritual kingdom of God. In their allusions to natural phenom-

ena, therefore, the Scriptures often use language which, interpreted scientifically, is contradicted by reasonings and discoveries that have been accepted by all, but, considered as illustrations of the spiritual import of the word, is seen to be in perfect unison with both spiritual and physical truth. The readers of the Bible, in most instances, now easily comprehend such language, whereas formerly great errors were often entertained. In earlier days the Manicheans announced the doctrine of the antipodes, involving, of course, the sphericity of the globe. A writer by the name of Cosmas undertook the refutation of such teaching by a system of the world which he fabricated upon *data* given in the Holy Scriptures. St. Paul had spoken of "the face of the earth," and of "our earthly house of this tabernacle." These, and other similar expressions, were enough for Cosmas. To his mind it was perfectly clear—*a fact of revealed truth*—that the surface of the earth was a plain, and that its form was that of an oblong parallelogram, for such was that of the tabernacle in the wilderness!

With reference to such facts in the history of science, the world has long since come to know that the language of revelation is often used with little or no regard to scientific accuracy, but merely as it would be understood by those to whom it was immediately given, and in whose days it was penned. What we now need is that this principle of interpretation be so extended as to admit it as a general truth, that the Bible does not teach science as such, but only refers to some of her more prominent facts for illustration, and then not in language

of scientific fidelity, but of popular import. A too *literal* interpretation of Scripture must not be adhered to when scientific truth is under consideration.

Another source of the opposition spoken of is the tenacity with which many believers hold their opinions, and, on the other hand, the eager haste with which scientists adopt opinions that are new.

In theology old beliefs come on down the current of the ages, and are frequently accepted as incontrovertible truth, without anyone undertaking to examine or test their foundations. They have been the beliefs of the Church, and that is sufficient. In this way many things have been confidently believed to be in the Bible, and, looked at through minds previously prepared to receive them, have really appeared to have been read upon the inspired page—which things, in fact, may have no existence, except as interlined or interpolated to support the cherished creeds or theories of men.

Then, again, many persons evince a disposition to take for granted that science cannot but be false, or, even if true, must be rejected, and hence, failing properly to appreciate the issue, refuse to investigate the truth; while others fear disagreeable conclusions as the result of their studies, and, though assured that their faith cannot suffer in the least from such result, prefer not to differ from their brethren, and cannot bear to have their "orthodoxy" called in question. The tyranny of orthodoxy has done much to stifle inquiry in both scientific and religious thought, and, more than all papal anathemas, has checked the development of the human mind.

But we have said that scientists are too hasty in the adoption of opinions that are novel and contradictory of the old faiths. For instance: relics of human art are discovered beneath the deposits of the Nile, and immediately it is published to the world that mankind have been on the earth at least twenty thousand years; or, a human skull is found along with certain of the earlier animal remains, and a still more remote antiquity is ascribed to the race; conclusions drawn from the single observations of individual explorers! Alas for Bacon and induction! A single additional discovery overthrows the conclusion in the one case, showing that the pottery in Egypt is no older than the time of Alexander, of Macedon; and it is now held to be highly probable that the skull found its present locality in consequence of the action of a stream of water.

Take a specimen or two of the reasonings of Darwin. He calls attention to the fact that on the ears of some persons are small tips, or projections, and then, because in certain species of monkey the ear is slightly tipped, or pointed, he gives this as an evidence of our descent from the monkey—leaving without such honorable descent, so far as this argument is concerned, the vast numbers of men and women whose ears have no tips; and forgetting that if the tipped ear proves our descent from the monkey, our projecting noses might equally establish our pedigree from the ant-eater or the elephant. Again, because the black bear was reported seen swimming in the waters, and feeding upon little insects, he argues that if the supply of insects should

not fail, and no stronger competitor should appear to take them from the bear, the latter might, in the course of ages, become a creature "as monstrous as a whale." By parity of reasoning, a man, by feeding upon corn, and in a stable, might become a horse; or shut up in a pasture, and nipping grass, he might turn into an ox or an ass. We suppose that Mr. Darwin would explain Nebuchadnezzar's reäppearance in Babylon, without any of the asinine or bovine characteristics other than men generally possess, by asserting that "seven times" were not sufficient to pass over him.

Volumes might be written upon the reckless reasonings of the men of science. Had we the time, we think we could show that a vast deal of their reasonings is of so unscientific a character that we can only wonder how any reasonable mind can accept it. *It assumes as fact what is bare conjecture; it makes induction with little or no generalization; it accepts testimony without proper regard either to the number or the character of the witnesses; it violates the known laws of thought and reason; it contradicts itself in innumerable instances;* and, with all this, it publishes to the world, and demands our acceptance of them, theories which it pretends to have originated it its own discoveries, but which, the history of philosophy teaches, had their origin *long anterior to* what is understood as science, only in the disposition of men to engage in wild speculation and *extravagant conjecture.*

We digress a moment, to make a few statements in support of this last assertion. The ancient Hindoos believed in spontaneous generation and devel-

opment, and the Egyptians taught a system so strikingly similar to that of many scientists of to-day, that Sir Charles Lyell smiles at the coincidence, and remarks that it "does not essentially differ from the cosmological notions of some men of genius in modern Europe." Lucretius and Epicurus were as earnest believers in development and its cognate theories as was ever Huxley or Herbert Spencer. Varro, Virgil, and Pliny, were as real pantheists as Spinoza or any of his more recent disciples; and the last two were positivists that would have done honor to the school of Auguste Comte. Among the Jews, the Sadduces, it is well known, were materialists, and so were Aristoxenus and Epicurus, in classic literature, Thales of Miletus, Anaximenes, and Diogenes of Apollonia. The list might be extended indefinitely.

When such speculations were rife in an age so far antecedent to the birth of science, it seems very singular that men should announce them as the necessary fruit of scientific research. The history of the case shows that *not one of the theories* at the present day arrayed against religion ever had any real connection with the facts of science. A little more regard to the history of the past, and a little more attention to the true laws of reasoning, would do much toward disarming men of their hostile disposition—if, indeed, it would not make them cordially accept the faith they now so violently oppose.

The points at issue between science and religion are various. The creation of the world—whether, indeed, it was created in the ordinary sense of the term, or whether, with all its occupants, it was

evolved from unformed, shapeless matter eternally existing; the period when man began to live on the earth, together with the antiquity of the globe itself; the extent of the Noachian deluge; the descent of races, and whether, if created such, there was the creation of one original pair, or of several; the subject of providence and miracles; the efficacy of prayer, and the whole idea of the supernatural—such are the leading questions that have occasioned so much alarm to certain classes of believers, and excited such arrogant cries of victory, such jibes and taunts, on the part of their opponents.

In reference to all the above questions, we would remark, in the first place, that opposition to the general faith has been based not upon acknowledged, or even pretended, *facts* of science, but upon mere *inferences* drawn from such facts. Theories are not facts—they are mere hypotheses framed for the explanation of facts. While, therefore, the facts themselves may be beyond all contradiction, the theory which seeks to explain them may be wholly false. That the waters of Niagara are wearing away the channel at the rate of one foot per annum, as Sir Charles Lyell affirms, may be a fact indisputable; but that this has been the rate of their action in all preceding ages—that the falls originally began at the mouth of the river, and therefore thirty thousand years have been required that they might be located at their present position—is only a theory of the great author, and that, too, a theory contradicted by other men of science.

We may boldly affirm that however well-founded any of the present anti-Christian theories may

appear, they are as yet *mere* speculation. It has never yet been proven that the world is not the creation of God; men have not yet demonstrated that our abode upon the earth has been for tens of thousands of years; it has not been established, even with the faintest show of probability, that men are only cultivated apes; and science is far from having ascertained that God has never wrought a miracle for the world. If, therefore, the Christian really believes his creed to be true, let him not be shaken in his faith by any claim, or pretension, of science—at least, while science consists to so great a degree only of plausible theories, instead of established conclusions.

But the fears of many are anticipative only, apprehending that these theories may hereafter be so thoroughly tested that no rational mind can withhold assent. We may confidently assert that if such should ever be the case, if the extravagant claims of scientists on the points above enumerated should ever compel our acceptance, it will, by that time, be ascertained that there is no real antagonism between these claims and the declarations of Scripture. A most wonderful characteristic of the Bible is that a wide margin has been left upon its pages, on which may be noted scientific discoveries as they occur, without crowding, or displacing, any of its own recorded statements. If we bear in mind two considerations—*first*, the necessity of observing only what Scripture declares, as distinguished from long-established interpretations; and, *secondly*, the duty of holding ourselves ready to accept whatsoever new interpretations the progress of thought shall

justly demand—we may rest assured that the Christian's faith can never be subverted. So far, there has not been one single well-established conclusion of science which has not been found, upon a careful survey of the general scope of both science and revelation, to be in perfect accord with our religion —and so we may boldly believe it will ever be. We hesitate not to say that the views of such as Darwin, Huxley, Wallace, and Spencer, will either be found to be mere speculation, or, if established by evidence we cannot resist, will be seen perfectly to harmonize with all truly legitimate interpretations of the word.

And the reconciliation between such theories and the Bible will be no very difficult matter.

The Bible does not teach that the world was formed by an instantaneous exercise of creative power. Between the formless and void condition spoken of, and the arrangement of materials into their present condition, there is room for an indefinite number of ages of formation. If, therefore, science claims that creation was a slow, gradual work through incalculable periods, and arrays before us proof which we cannot gainsay, we may safely admit the claim, especially if the processes of formation be almost identical with those recorded by Moses.

So when the Scriptures declare that God has made of one blood all the nations of the earth, this does not necessarily mean of *one descent;* it may mean *of one common nature,* and God may have formed a dozen different progenitors of the race, and in as many various localities, yet, if in them

all the nature is the same, we have the condition required by the expression, "Of one blood." Such was the idea of the honored and lamented Agassiz. In any account of the history of man, we stop short if we trace our origin only to Adam. St. Luke runs the genealogy of Jesus back to Seth, the son of Adam, "which was the *son of God.*" If, therefore, there are more races than one, they are likewise descended from God, the universal Father; and thus, after all, we are of the same origin, endowed with the same common nature, of one blood and lineage.

The Bible does not profess to teach us ethnology. It may therefore make mention of no other race than that in the line of which Jesus descended—the only object of the Bible being to teach us the truth in Jesus; but this does not preclude the possibility of other races any more than the Chinaman's map, with the "great outside country" printed upon the spaces which should represent the other nations, proves the "Celestial" to be the only empire on earth. Spontaneous generation, evolution, development—these are not essentially opposed to the Bible. The leading idea of them all is that the present forms of nature have been evolved from preëxisting forms, and these from forms still prior, these again from others—each preceding evolution being less perfect than the subsequent—until we reach, in the upward scale, the lowest conceivable, or the lowest possible, form sprung originally from fire, mist, star-dust, or chaos. We say there is nothing here necessarily antagonistic to our religion; certainly nothing tending to expunge the idea of God from the mind. Darwin does not hold his theory as opposed

to belief in God; and the author of the "Vestiges," who has done more than all others to give weight to the development theory, refers the entire process, originally, to the will and power of Jehovah. "We advance," says he, "from law to the *cause* of law, and ask, What is that? Here science leaves us, but only to conclude from other grounds that there is a *first cause*, to which all others are secondary and ministrative—a primitive almighty will, of which these laws are merely the mandates. That great Being! who shall say where is his dwelling-place? Man pauses, breathless, at the contemplation of a subject so much above his faculties, and can only wonder and adore."

In many respects, there is a remarkable coincidence between this development idea and the account given in Genesis. It is there commanded that the earth shall evolve from herself both the vegetable and the animal kingdoms. "And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind;" "Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth;" "Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth;" "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground."

In this account there is the largest liberty for introducing the elements of *law* and time; and certainly he who admits the teachings of geology can make no objection if we only allow a time when the *ascidian*, or whatever else we may call the first form of life, became *man*, *rational* and *immortal*.

The Bible does not say that God, like a potter, took up so much dust, moistened it, and made it into man, dismissing him at once from his hands, full grown and fully endowed. We may, if science should ever demand it, regard man as beginning under the form of the simplest animal, or even vegetable, growth, and passing upward through countless stages of development, provided we do not ascribe his development to law, apart from the agency of Deity.

We might suggest, likewise, how the other theories referred to may be harmonized with Scripture. These theories have been held, to a greater or less degree, even by the orthodox in all ages of the Church. Augustin was a believer in spontaneous generation—at least, so far as regards the production of vegetable and the lower forms of animal life—arguing that "all things are said to be created by the Divine command, because the water and the land produced them under the action of the same laws which are still in operation."

That the teachings of geology are accepted by many of the most approved theologians of the age is evidence sufficient that they may be held in perfect consistency with the biblical record. And the same may be said concerning the scientific view of miracles, prayer, and providence. There are not a few Christian writers who, equally with the scientist, believe in the invariability of natural law. Yet they accept these revealed truths because they regard the facts and phenomena involved in them as brought about by the power and wisdom of God, applying the general laws of physical nature to the

special interests of human life, just as men themselves apply the same laws. If men can avail themselves of the general laws of steam, electricity, magnetism, and gravitation, so as to produce the steam-engine, telegraph, printing-press, and other great agencies in the advancement of the race, without interfering with the action of these laws—if it is really only *in consequence* of the uniformity of natural laws that these effects are accomplished—there can surely be no dangerous error in believing that the almighty Ordainer of these laws can achieve the like, and far greater, results in the work of his special providence, in prayer, and in miracles. Every time a man uses even the most simple machinery in the arts—every time the agriculturist seeks, by chemical appliances, to enhance the fertility of his soil—every time we feed or clothe ourselves—we, in our limited sphere, are doing for ourselves with natural law just what God is doing for us, in the upper realm of his majesty and glory, when he answers prayer, or otherwise interposes to bless mankind.

We really cannot see why believers should concern themselves at all about the foregoing theories any more than with other intellectual problems, except when they impinge upon great and vital questions. Otherwise, whatsoever speculations have alarmed, and are now alarming, the Christian world should be regarded as the peculiar province of the scientist, and they should be settled upon the basis of scientific, and not of theological, evidence.

Some may consider us making dangerous concessions to the science of the day. We feel, how

ever, that we have really made no concessions. We have only endeavored to give to science her due without abating one jot or tittle of the authority of the word of God. We have too much confidence in the divinity of our religion to fear she may be endangered by any such liberality and candor as truth seems justly to demand. We believe the Bible is from God—we believe that, through all the oppositions of men and devils, its truth will stand; and hence we have no fear for any position we have taken, unless that position be either misapprehended or misapplied.

It cannot be too strongly urged that there is, and can be, no contrariety between science and the word of God. It may, to some, appear unnecessary, with all the intelligence of the nineteenth century, so frequently to repeat such a statement; but we cannot forget the vast numbers of really intelligent and devout persons who tremble for their faith at each new discovery or claim of science. Let all such fears be banished forever. Religion is from God, and so is the system of nature. Unless, therefore, we would array God against himself, having him in his word to contradict the teachings of his works, or in his works to gainsay the revelations of his word, we may feel assured that whatever conflict may arise between the two, this truth remains fixed forever: that if nature and revelation are both from God, their different facts and principles must be in perfect accord. Apparent contradictions there may be—indeed, we may say, *must be*—because our ideas, both of nature and religion, are necessarily limited, and we may never expect to

perceive perfect harmony between them until we shall have perfect understanding of them both, even in all their minutest details. Science deals with the natural, while revelation treats of the supernatural, in the empire of Deity; and while the two departments are so essentially distinct, touching only at a few points along their vast circumferences, we must ever be prepared to discern numbers of other points at which we shall behold only variance and inconsistency. Yet such variance will be in appearance only, relative to our imperfect views of things. When we shall have advanced farther in the idea of God, as taught in his word and in his works—when we shall see eye to eye, knowing even as we are known, the vast, complex, intricate mechanism of the heavens and the earth, understanding the great mysteries of godliness as revealed in the histories, the prophecies, and the gospels of the word—we shall then behold perfect harmony throughout, and science and religion, or the natural and the supernatural, will be found "together constituting the one system of God."

In the meantime, we dismiss all fear, and look forward with an unwavering faith. Christianity is of God, and opposition, from whatsoever source, is vain. She has shown herself superior to every conflict. To-day she confronts a thousand foes, yet she challenges all to investigate, and, if they can, to invalidate, her high pretensions. She claims that these pretensions to shed abroad on earth the light of heaven, and lead mankind, in all their nationalities up to God, have been confirmed by an amount of evidence and demonstration which the entire

world, in all its ages and with all its angry oppositions, has been unable to subvert. She seeks no patronage from men, from the learned or great, from the world of science or of criticism. She seeks no aid from either friend or foe; alike fearless of the onsets of the one, and independent of the resources of the other, she rises in the majesty of her own right, and asserts her claim to rule the nations. Reliant upon the justice of her claim, confident of her title and her birth, pointing backward, through a long genealogy of princes, to a heavenly origin, and forward through the fall of thrones and dynasties, she stands before the nations, waving her royal scepter, demanding that the grandest potentates do her reverence; and the whole earth, with her unnumbered millions, yield willing homage to her law.

THE OFFICE AND WORK OF THE SPIRIT.

BY THE REV. GEORGE T. GOULD, A.M.

"The Holy Spirit of God."—Eph. iv. 30.

THE doctrine of the Holy Ghost is a peculiarity of the Bible. We search in vain for its similitude in the dreamings of the philosophers, or in the revelations of the oracles. But while peculiar, it is by no means indefinite or unimportant. From the opening page, where the Spirit of God moves upon the face of the waters, to the concluding scene, in which "the Spirit and the bride say, Come," the Bible abounds in unequivocal references to this topic. For ages the human mind had swept from atheism, through polytheism, to pantheism, and back again, like an untiring pendulum measuring the amplitude of its vibrations. Through this are it must ever have continued to swing, had not revelation given us firm ground on which to rest. This ground is expressed in the single word TRINITY. Not a triplex—three essences in one person, or one essence three times repeated, or three persons of three essences—but a Trinity, a one undivided, eternal, spiritual essence subsisting in three persons. Whether we deny the first, with Arius, or the second, with Sabellius, we alike subvert the truth and shipwreck our salvation. If you ask, How can God be One in substance and essence, and yet Three in the mode of

his existenee? I tell you, frankly, I do not know. There is no mystery in the facts revealed—one God and three persons; but as to *how* these things can be true, mystery shuts out the answer. There is no mystery in the fact that on the same tree may be a branch bearing pears and another bearing quinces. Many have seen and tasted for themselves; and yet none can tell how, from the same sap, drawn from the same soil, through the same roots, and passing up by the same stem, the one branch will make the delicious, juicy pear, and the other the hard and astringent quince. So I receive the facts of the Trinity, though I may not be able to explain the manner of their coëxistence—preferring to anchor the ship of my reason to the firm moorings of revelation, rather than to scud before the storms of speculation, to be wrecked upon the sands of atheism or ingulfed in the sea of conflicting doubts.

As there are three persons in the Godhead, so each has his office and ministry; and we had just as well expeet to dispense with the Father or the Son, in redemption, as with the Spirit. His peculiar work is set forth in the very name by which he is designated—Holy Ghost. He cannot be called holy because he excels in this attribute the other persons in the Trinity, but because it is his office to sanctify men or make them holy. "But ye are washed, but ye are sanetified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." (1 Cor. vi. 11.)

I. If the Spirit makes men holy, by eonsidering the steps in that proeess we arrive at once at a knowledge of his offiee and work. We shall take

two things for granted: first, what few will deny, man is a sinner, and Christ's atonement is his only salvation; secondly, that faith is *the* condition of application to our individual wants. (1) But before faith there must be knowledge: illumination precedes trust. "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?" (Rom. x. 14.) Hence, the first step in the Spirit's work was to make known the plan of redemption. "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." "Holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2) To be available, however, the truth thus made known must be spread abroad; for "How shall they hear without a preacher?" To secure a constant and proper ministry, the second step in the work of the Spirit is to call and qualify the gospel preacher. "How shall they preach, except they be sent?" (Rom. x. 15.) "Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest, that he would send forth labourers into his harvest." (Luke x. 2.) "The Holy Ghost said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. They, being sent forth by the Holy Ghost, departed," etc. (Acts xiii. 2, 4.) (3) But truth need not affect the conscience, nor by a knowledge of it is obedience necessitated. Men may "hold the truth in unrighteousness." (Rom. i. 18.) "Ye knew your duty, but ye did it not," while proclaiming the deepest guilt must ever announce a want of dependence between knowledge and holiness. So we find it written, "I have planted, Apollos watered; but God gave the increase." (1 Cor. iii. 6.) "Pray for us, that the word of the Lord may have free course, and

be glorified." (2 Thess. iii. 1.) "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts." (Zech. iv. 6.) The third step, then, is for the Spirit to carry the gospel preached home to the hearts of the people, or to fulfill the promise of Christ: "When he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." (John xvi. 8.)

And now the sinner stands convicted and repentant, conscious of guilt and anxious for pardon, realizing his ruin, and hungering and thirsting for righteousness. How shall he be made holy? Here the great work of the Spirit comes in. For convenience of classification we may consider the Spirit's work under three divisions: (1) that done for the sinner in bringing him to desire salvation—(*a*) inspiring the word, (*b*) calling the ministry, (*c*) and convicting the irreligious; (2) that done for the sinner in the act of translation from darkness to light, from Satan to God—regenerating or creating him anew in Christ Jesus; (3) and that done for the soul thus regenerated—(*a*) bearing witness to its adoption, (*b*) strengthening it for duty, (*c*) and comforting it in trouble. As the first of these may be considered preliminary, the last supplemental, and the second, or regeneration, the characteristic and essential work of the Holy Spirit, it will be expected that we devote to it the major part of our consideration.

II. That a man must be born again no one denies who receives the Bible as the word of God; but in what that birth consists, and by what means it is accomplished, have furnished material for many a

theologieal contest. Nor is this a mere war of words, involving no vital issue. If it be true, "Except a man be born again he eannot see the kingdom of God," then the substitution of something else for this necessary experience can only prove to the eternal damage of the soul. Lord, thou hast said, "If any man laek wisdom let him ask of God." Wouldst thou be pleased to guide us into all truth? Regeneration is the change through which a man passes from sin into holiness; and the sense of holy, aceording to Webster, is whole, entire, eomplete, sound, unimpaired. Regeneration, then, is that ehange by which the ruin of soul, aecomplished by sin, is repaired, and the soul made whole, or eomplete, as to its moral powers. So if we can ascertain what the soul loses by sin, we can know what is its regeneration, or restoration. (1) It loses its innoeenee and beeomes eondemned. But this is a change that takes plaee outside of the soul—a change of its relation to the law, and not of its moral powers. Henee justification, or the restoration of its innocenee, which takes plaee in the mind of the Judge, and not within the soul itself, cannot form any part of this renewal. To illustrate from earthly things: a thief is pardoned by the governor, and is thus justified in the eyes of the law; but this does not prevent him from being a thief at heart. So the justifieation of the sinner changes his relation to the law, but works no ehange in his moral nature. (2) But, seeondly, there is a change wrought by sin within the very soul itself. Sin is not merely an aet bringing condemnation; it is a principle acting upon the moral nature as poison, or as the virus of

disease acts upon the physical frame. This effect may be considered under two aspects: (*a*) pollution, and (*b*) death. (*a*) The sinful soul is so vile and degraded, so polluted and unholy, so utterly disgusting and disgustful, that in the Scriptures it is compared to a cage of unclean birds, a diseased and filthy dead body, or a sepulcher full of rottenness and dead men's bones. These are figurative expressions, but they are certainly figurative of something. They can only describe a moral state as impure as are these physical conditions. Hence the prayer of the penitent is, "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin. Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." (Ps. li. 2, 7.) The promise is, "From all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." (Ezek. xxxvi. 25.) (*b*) But the death of the soul, or the destruction of its ability to accomplish any good, is even more appalling than this state of pollution. "You hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." (Eph. ii. 1.) As to the extent of this loss of power there is much controversy, many contending the loss is but partial, while the term "total depravity" fills them with horror. Inspiration has forever settled this point by the very term it employs. If there be the faintest manifestation of life, we cannot say a thing is dead; if it be dead, there is positively the absence of all life. So when the Bible declares man to be morally dead, it declares the total extinction of moral life or ability. With this statement correspond such assertions as, "In me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is

present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would, I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do." (Rom. vii. 18, 19.) "To be carnally minded is death. The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." (Rom. viii. 6–8.) A more complete state of utter inability cannot well be described. To the perfecting of the soul, or the rendering of it holy, there must be the renewing of its power. Hence David, typical of all sinners, prays, "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me;" while such expressions as "quickened," "born again," and "begotten anew," are employed to designate the condition of the regenerate. (3) From these things it follows that regeneration is not (*a*) a change of manners from ill-doing to well-doing; (*b*) nor a change of sentiment from infidelity to nominal acceptance of Christianity; (*c*) nor a change of state from membership in the world to membership in the Church; (*d*) nor a change of interest from cold indifference to blazing profession of zeal. We may cry with Jehu, Come, see my zeal! we may arrogate to ourselves the only right to be called the children of God, pronouncing all others to be but sects and sectarians; we may plant ourselves upon the ordinances and externals of religion, contending that performance of these constitutes regeneration, and yet be as destitute of the thing itself as misery is destitute of happiness. To all such Christ replies, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom." "The king-

dom of God is not in word, but in power." "The kingdom of God is within you." Regeneration is not these changes. (*c*) *It is that complete, fundamental, radical change of man's moral nature, whereby he is freed from the pollution and power of sin, and receives anew the ability to do that which is acceptable to God;* because it restored what sin has destroyed.

III. The question naturally presents itself, By what means is this recreation of the moral powers accomplished? We answer, By the Spirit of God.

(1) Our first argument is, that this is philosophical. Man is composed of three distinct, but intimately connected, natures—the physical, the intellectual, and the spiritual. For an effect to be produced upon either of these, the cause must be of the same nature as the part affected. (*a*) Regeneration is not a physical change. The shriveled limb, the halting gait, the stammering tongue, the filthy flesh, are not removed. Hence it cannot be produced by any physical act whatever, whether baptism, laying on of hands, or partaking of the Lord's Supper. (*b*) Nor is it a mental transformation. All the imperfections of the mind remain as they were; and, therefore, the truth, whether gathered from the inspired page, the lips of the ministry, or the voice of the schools, is inadequate to produce regeneration. (*c*) It is, as we have seen, a great spiritual renovation, and must be produced by the only spiritual agent capable of exerting such transforming power—the Spirit of God.

(2) The second argument is, that the Scriptures make it our duty to pray for regeneration, and its concomitant blessings. No one at all acquainted

with the Scriptures will deny this statement. The reïterated eommand is, Seek, knock, ask; and every promise that compliance with these demands shall be erowned with suceess is but a reäffirmation of the position for which we contend.

(3) A third argument is, that regeneration is attributed to the Spirit in the word of God. (*a*) "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but aeeording to his merey he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." (Titus iii. 5, 6.) The "renewing of the Holy Ghost" means a renewing accomplished by the Holy Ghost. So "the washing of regeneration" can only mean a washing which regeneration produees. Had the expression been regeneration of washing—a regeneration which a washing produees—then we might understand it as spoken of baptism; but since it is the washing of regeneration—a washing produced by regeneration, a washing which God performs and not we ourselves—we cannot so understand it. It has already been shown that regeneration consists of two parts: purifying and renovating; and in this text we have them both presented, washing and renewing, and they are alike ascribed by St. Paul to the Spirit shed on us abundantly. (*b*) Again, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii. 5.) If water-baptism is signified by the phrase "born of water," we have clearly taught the damnation of all infants dying unbaptized. Christ says, "Except a man"—in the Greek, *tis*, in-

definite pronoun, anyone, man, woman, or child—"Except anyone is born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The Fathers, understanding the force of this indefinite pronoun, and believing the expression to signify baptism, quoted the passage to prove baptism essential to infant salvation. If we understand baptism to be the meaning of "born of water," then we are logically and grammatically driven to assume the position of the Fathers. This is so repugnant to every teaching of God's word that we are compelled to reject any interpretation by which it is necessitated. Notice, again, there is but one birth: "Ye must be born again." Whatever, then, born of water and the Spirit may mean, it can but describe parts of one and the same birth. Notice, also, this one birth is spiritual. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." Nicodemus had wondered how a man could be born again physically when he was old. Christ replies it would be useless if he could, for flesh can produce only flesh. That of which he was speaking was spiritual, and could be produced only by the Spirit; therefore, he had said, "Ye must be born again." Now, the merest tyro in science knows that water is the great physical purifier, and the merest novice in theology is likewise aware that water symbolizes the purifying influence of the Spirit. We have, then, in this text, the twofold aspect of regeneration—purifying, or born of water, and renewing, or born of the Spirit—and the two constitute the one

spiritual birth. (*c*) "From all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you." (Ezek. xxxvi. 25.) Here we have the purifying process. "A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh. . . . and I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes." (Ver. 26, 27.) This is the renewing process, or we have in the three verses both parts of regeneration, and have them ascribed by the Almighty to himself. (*d*) "Put off . the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." (Eph. iv. 22-24.) Or, as the same thing is expressed in Col. iii. 10: "Put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." The apostle thus presents us with the same ideas—renewing and cleansing, or putting off that which is corrupt. But he gives us additional information: first, as to the part renewed—"the spirit of your mind," the very essence, as it were, of our immortal nature; and, secondly, as to that of which the renewing consists—"after the image of him that created him." We know that God originally created man in his own likeness and after his own image, and this text makes regeneration the recreation of that likeness and image when destroyed by sin. See that body of Adam as it came forth from the forming hand of God: it had eyes, but they were closed—the light painted no pictures upon their retinas; it had

a tongue, but that tongue lay still within its ivory walls—it stirred not the surrounding atmosphere into waves of harmony; it had ears, but they were deaf to the voice of the charmer, "charm he never so wisely;" it had limbs, but they moved not to and fro in the duties of life; it had lungs, but they were like a bellows gone to wreck—no air stirred through them; it had a heart, but that heart beat not to the tune of life's conflict; it had a brain, but never a thought went lightly leaping through all that brain's mysterious caverns. How shall that body become a living being, inhabited by a soul stamped with the image and likeness of God? Shall the blood, self-moved, course its way along the veins, warming the heart until it bounds into activity, and sends the blood back again through all the arterial channels? Shall the lungs begin to heave, and the eyes to unclose, and the limbs to move, and the brain to act, and the various organs to perform their proper functions? And from these physical movements will there be engendered a soul bearing God's likeness and image? I tell you, Nay! To produce this spiritual life, God must breathe into the nostrils the breath of life, and then Adam became a living soul. In like manner God's Spirit must be breathed upon the soul in its recreation. No less power is requisite for perfect restoration after complete ruin than for original creation. The Spirit of God made man at the first in the divine likeness, and nothing but the Spirit of God can restore that likeness. Paul sustains this reasoning, and affirms regeneration, or the transforming of the sinner into the image of God, to be by the

Spirit: "We all, with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord." (2 Cor. iii. 18.) (*e*) The last argument upon this point is from John. As though fully aware of the controversy in these latter days, the apostle asserts, in unmistakable language: "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." (John i. 12, 13.) Here the self-conversion theory is plucked up, root and branch. The new birth is made dependent upon a power given by the Almighty, and is ascribed directly and exclusively to him. *Regeneration, then, is not only a fundamental spiritual change, but one produced by the Spirit.*

IV Of the supplemental work but little need be said, save to quote a passage or two of Scripture to show that it pertains to the Spirit. (1) Witness: "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." (Gal. iv. 6.) "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." (Rom. viii. 9.) "And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is truth." (1 John v. 6.) (2) Strengthening for duty: "Uphold me with thy free Spirit." (Ps. li. 12.) "I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes." (Ezek. xxxvi. 27.) God grant you "to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man." (Eph. iii. 16.) (3) Comfort in trouble: "I will pray the

Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever." "I will not leave you comfortless." "The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost." (John xiv. 16, 18, 26.)

V A question of vital importance, presenting itself just here, is, How does the Spirit perform the work thus attributed to him? There are two ways in which a man may be said to do any thing: (1) directly, when he does it himself; and (2) indirectly, when he accomplishes it through the instrumentality of an agent. So the agent employed may be one of two kinds: (1) passive, when acting only as acted upon; and (2) active, performing the part without the presence and personal effort of the principal. A soldier kills a man, and sends his servant to bury him. The soldier may be said to both kill and bury the man—kill him with the sword, and bury him by his servant. But how different the facts in the two cases! In the first, the soldier actually performs the work; in the second, he does not really do it at all. The first is an example of a passive, the second of an active, agent. (1) Now, it is not denied that in some of his office-work the Spirit acts through an agent—the written word. (2) It is furthermore evident that, in the communication of the knowledge which goes before faith, this agent, or word, is active. When the Spirit first gave the truth to men, he acted directly and without any agent. "Holy men spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." But as soon as this truth was given, it became the active agent in illuminating the race; and now no one receives any knowledge of divine truth otherwise than from the word of

God. Only in the sense in which the soldier may be said to bury the man by his servant, can the Holy Ghost be said to make us wise unto salvation. The servant really does the burying, and the Bible teaches us it is the Scriptures which are sufficient to make us wise. (3) The question to consider is, whether the Spirit is thus passive in all his work, while the word, written or spoken, is the active agent. There is such a dangerous heresy maintained in the land. The broad position is taken that the Spirit having inspired the word, no farther influence is either given or necessary; that all moral power is confined to words and arguments; and, apart from the Scriptures, the Spirit neither will nor can exert any influence. They use a clock or a watch as a favorite method of illustrating their position. The various parts are made and fitly framed together by a skillful artist; and though he may be dead, or a thousand miles away, yet so long as the piece continues to mark the hours of the day, its operations may be attributed to him. So, say they, the Holy Ghost inspired the Scriptures, and started them forth upon their mission of mercy; and as long as they are successful in saving men, the Spirit may be said to do it, though he now has no personal connection with the matter. Or, they illustrate it after this wise: You have a friend in a distant place, whom you wish to influence to a certain course of conduct. You write him a letter, using all the arguments and persuasives at your command. Your entire power over him is contained in and exhausted by the letter; for after it is sent there is nothing more that you can do. Should your friend be influenced

to the desired course, you may be said to have caused the change. The Holy Ghost, in like manner, has exhausted his power of persuasion in the Testaments; and if the men who now read them are influenced to be religious, the result may be attributed to him, though he has put forth no new power since holy men of old spoke as they were moved. This would make the Bible an active agent. We object: (*a*) The part of the Spirit's work which we know beyond controversy he accomplishes by means of an active agent is never attributed to him in the Scriptures—we mean the present instruction of men in the facts of salvation. The inference is, therefore, manifest that where such a work as conviction, or regeneration, is attributed to the Spirit, no active agent is employed. (*b*) Such a theory does away with a personal Spirit from the plan of redemption. The maker of the clock might be in Europe; the writer of the letter may have died before its reception; yet, by these events, no change would be produced in the final result. So when John finished his Revelation upon the Isle of Patmos, the Holy Ghost might just as well have been blotted from the Godhead, as far as concerns any personal connection with the salvation of men; and the multiplied pages of the Bible, occupied with describing the office and work of the Spirit, are but labored expressions of what has no existence. (*c*) The theory ignores the true nature of regeneration; it proceeds upon the supposition that man needs but to be informed and persuaded that he has the inherent power to cease to do evil and learn to do well, and regeneration is but this change of conduct, or submission to

baptism, by which this change of conduct is begun and symbolized. But we have seen that regeneration is a fundamental spiritual change, necessitated by the deep depravity of man's nature; and we therefore conclude it can be produced by no chain of argument or plan of reasoning, though such be devised by the Spirit himself. (*d*) Such a theory renders prayer, in the sense of petition, the silliest of all useless ceremonies. Often have I been amused as I have heard men contend most vociferously in their sermons for this active agency of the word, yet, in their prayers, ask God to bless the discourse, revive religion in the neighborhood, and comfort his people—things over which Heaven exercises no shadow of control, and can exercise none, if the Spirit acts only through the revealed truth. How absurd of me to beg a man that he will influence his friend to a certain course, when I know he has already written to that friend, and has exhausted all the influence of which he is possessed! Yet this absurdity is practiced every time the supporters of this theory go in prayer to God. (*e*) But this theory of the activity of the word and passivity of the Spirit is overthrown by the Bible itself. I find the Scriptures denominated the "sword of the Spirit," and compared to a "hammer that breaketh the rocks in pieces." Both of these we know to be perfectly passive instruments. They are effective in exact proportion to the ability of the hand that wields them, and when released from such hand they are unable to accomplish the end designed. By these comparisons the Bible is not only shown to be no active agent, but to be so passive an agent

that, if separated from the direct, personal, and continuous influence of the Spirit, it is inadequate to the production of good, or the destruction of evil. (*f*) But, says one, I read an expression or two, which would seem to support the theory. (1) For example, Does not Jesus himself say the word is the Spirit? Not exactly. In the sixth of John he assured the people that unless they ate his flesh and drank his blood, they had no life in them. At this many stumbled, declaring it a hard saying. Jesus, to show them he had no reference to actual physical eating, but that his words were to be taken in a spiritual sense, informed them, "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." To dissociate this from its context, and attempt to found upon it an argument that where the Scriptures use the term Spirit, we must understand the word, or Bible, is certainly sufficient to excite a blush of shame upon the face of any not blinded by prejudice, or idiotic in intelligence. (2) Again, the new birth is attributed to the word, the apostle using such expressions as "born by the word," and "begotten with the word." The only point to settle in all such references is, whether the word is an active or a passive agent. An illustration, perhaps, may meet this objection more fully than any formal argument. A man is drowning: a friend throws him a rope; he seizes hold upon it, is drawn to the shore, and is saved. A witness of the transaction says, I saw a man drowning, and he was saved by a friend; another, I saw a man drowning, and he was saved by a rope; still a third deposes, I saw a man

drowning, and he saved himself by laying hold of a rope. Now, all three of these are correct. The friend upon the bank was the agent; the rope was the passive instrument employed within a certain sphere, and the laying hold was the act of the man by which he appropriated the relief to himself. In the conversion of a sinner, the Holy Spirit is the efficient agent; the Bible, in its own proper and limited sphere, is the passive instrument; and faith is the act of the man, by which the benefit is secured. So that it may be said, depending entirely on the stand-point of observation, A man is saved by faith, by the word, or by the Spirit. We are compelled, then, to conclude that even where the Spirit employs the word as his agent, that word is passive, requiring the unceasing and active effort of the Spirit to render it effective. (3) But there is a part of the Spirit's office in which no agent is employed, in which he acts directly and immediately upon the soul of man. The question of ability does not present itself. No one has denied it. Does he so act in the economy of grace? (*a*) Our first argument is founded upon the necessity for such influence. Go with Ezekiel into that valley of dry bones. The valley is full, and the bones are very dry. Shall these dry bones live? Ezekiel is commanded to prophesy to the bones; and though he delivered the message as he received it from God, and though this message accomplished that whereunto it was sent—insomuch that while he was speaking there was a noise and a shaking as the bones came together, bone to his bone, and the sinews and the flesh came upon them, and the skin covered them above—yet, when all this was done,

"there was no breath in them;" they were as destitute of life as when, a confused mass of dry bones, they lay bleaching and crumbling beneath the winds and rains of heaven. It was only when he prophesied unto the winds, "Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain!" that they lived and stood upon their feet, an exceeding great army. So we may sit beneath the droppings of the sanctuary, and hear the express word of God—and that word may run and be glorified, proving sharper than any two-edged sword—yet it can produce only a noise and a shaking in the camp of the ungodly. It may enlighten the mind, and, under the influence of the Spirit, it may convict the heart, and men thus enlightened and convicted may even improve their morals, having the sinews and the flesh to come upon them, and the skin to cover them above—yet they will be destitute of all spiritual life till Christ shall breathe upon them as he did upon his disciples after his resurrection, and say, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost;" until the Spirit himself beget in them the principles of a new life. (1) The result of sin is filth, pollution. Stand by the ragged and filthy sons of want and idleness; read to them the Scriptures, and how long will it be till, at the sound of the words, the scales will fall from their unwashed bodies? I trow that death would steal upon you ere your task was done. If the word cannot remove the filth of the flesh, how much more is it incompetent to remove the filth of the soul? As there must be an immediate and literal application of water to cleanse the one, so there must be an immediate and literal application of the Spirit to

cleanse the other. (2) The result of sin is disease. When the halt, and maimed, and blind, and leprous, came to the disciples to be healed, did they read to them extracts from the words of Jesus? or preach them sermons divinely inspired? And what would be the success of an infirmary, now, whose regimen should consist of readings from the evangelists, instead of pills, powders, and plasters? If physical disease resists the voice of the truth, and requires the immediate application of physical remedies, how can we expect the disease of the soul—that foul plague-spot, eating its way into the very vitals of our spiritual nature—how can we expect it to be destroyed by the illumination of the mind with divine truth? (3) The result of sin is death. Suppose the sisters of Lazarus had sat beside the grave of their brother, and read selections from the prophets, or repeated, as far as memory served them, the words of the Divine Master, think you worms and corruption would have given over their prey, and Lazarus been restored to their embracing arms? Or, who would send weeping friends to our cemeteries, that, with Testament in hand, they may call back the loved and lost? If the death of the body is unaffected by the word of truth, why delude the soul into the belief that its dead state can thus be removed? Its destroyed powers can be restored only by him who created them. Not the truth illuminating the mind, but "It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure." (4) Sin is a law, a force, in our nature. Paul, in the seventh of Romans, describes a man who has been instructed; he knows the good, and approves of it;

he is convicted, hating the evil and desiring to do that which is right. The truth has exerted its power upon him, and yet he is a miserable man. The good he would do he does not, and the evil he would not that he does; because there is a law in his members—a force, a principle, a power—bringing him into captivity to the law of sin and death. In the eighth chapter he describes a man delivered from this bondage, walking in newness of life, and in comfort of the Spirit. What has wrought this change? "The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." This law of death is no written code—this law, dwelling in his members, bringing him into captivity, and preventing him from doing good, whilst it compelled him to do evil. It is a force, a power, a principle, having its origin in a personal reigning devil, "the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." How is this devil to be cast out, and his power destroyed? By arguing with him? By quoting Scripture with greater rapidity than he can quote it? The Bible tells us, "When a strong man armed keepeth his place, his goods are in peace: but when a stronger than he shall come upon him, and overcome him, he taketh from him all his armour wherein he trusted, and divideth his spoils." There is, therefore, but one power in the universe which can destroy the law of sin, and that is "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus." As "the law of sin" is not a code, but a force, a principle, emanating from an indwelling devil, and producing sin and death, so the law of the Spirit of life is

not a code, but a force—a principle, a power—proceeding from the indwelling Spirit, and producing life and holiness. Hence says Paul, "But ye are not in the flesh"—this state of captivity to sin and death—"but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God *dwell in you.*" (Rom. viii. 9.) These arguments will suffice to show that, in part, at least, of the plan of salvation, there is necessity for the Spirit's working without the instrumentality of an agent. (*b*) A second line of argument may be evolved from the proposition that in many places the Spirit and the word are spoken of as two distinct agents in man's conversion. "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." (2 Thess. ii. 13.) Here we have two distinct instrumentalities—the truth, producing belief, and the Spirit, producing sanctification. What God has thus put asunder let no man join into one. "In whom ye also trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation: in whom also, after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." (Eph. i. 13.) "Ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren." (1 Peter i. 22.) I am utterly unable to understand how inspiration could thus speak of the Spirit and the word as having different and distinct influences and operations, if the one acted only and entirely through the other. (*c*) But, again, if the Spirit does not act directly and immediately upon the heart, then many passages in the word of God are utterly inexplicable. Of these we can give but

examples. (1) "As Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." (Rom. vi. 4.) To "walk in newness of life," we must be "created in Christ Jesus unto good works;" and, in the text before us, the manner is said to be "*as* Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father." Upon this the Scriptures themselves furnish a most suggestive comment. "God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by his own power." (1 Cor. vi. 14.) "Though he was crucified through weakness, yet he liveth by the power of God. For we also are weak in him, but we shall live with him by the power of God toward you." (2 Cor. xiii. 4.) In these two places it is affirmed that Christ's resurrection and ours are results of one and the same power. But in Rom. viii. 11, we learn that this power is the Spirit that dwelleth in his children. "If the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raiseth up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." If, then, it is the Spirit of God who raised up Christ, it is the Spirit of God who enables us to "walk in newness of life;" for *as* Christ was raised up *so* we walk. He who can believe that, in the resurrection of Jesus and of his people, the Spirit's action is confined to the word, is certainly prepared to believe any monstrosity. (2) Again, such expressions abound as these: "Ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise." (Eph. i. 13.) "The Holy Spirit wherewith ye are sealed." (Eph. iv. 30.) Can we conceive of a stamp, or any other sealing instru-

ment, acting indirectly or through another medium? Indeed, could we present a stronger figure of immediate and direct influence than the stamp leaving its impress upon the wax? Yet God has used this very figure to show the Spirit's influence upon the soul. (3) So texts of this import are almost without number: "If so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." (Rom. v. 8.) "Know ye not that ye are the temple of the Holy Ghost, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" (1 Cor. iii. 13.) "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you?" (1 Cor. vi. 9.) "God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts." (Gal. ix. 6.) "It is the Spirit that beareth witness." "He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." (1 John v. 6, 10.) "The Spirit *itself* beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." (Rom. viii. 16.) To comment upon these would be like an effort to gild refined gold, or heighten with earthly dyes the tints of the rainbow. Blind, indeed, must he be who, in all these, cannot see a personal Spirit performing his work directly and immediately upon the hearts of men.

Brother, have you experienced this work of the Spirit in your own individual case? Rest not in forms and symbols, signs and ceremonies. Go to God at once, and receive from him that immediate and direct influence of the Spirit which will cleanse your moral filth, and renew your lost spiritual power; which will witness to your adoption into the Divine family, will strengthen you for all duty, and comfort you amidst the sorrows of life. "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God."

REPENTANCE AND FAITH.

BY THE REV. JOS. W. FITCH.

"Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."—Acts xx. 21.

THIS language is a part of the address of Paul to the elders of Ephesus, whom he had called together on a special occasion at Miletus.

After reminding them of the manner of his life while at Ephesus, he adverts to the character of his teaching, declaring that he had avoided every unprofitable as well as every pernicious thing, and that he had proclaimed the truth alike in its purity and in its fullness. He not only preached the truth without any mixture of error, but he shunned not "to declare unto them *all* the counsel of God." He "kept back nothing," the knowledge of which was essential.

The text presents a concise and faithful plan of the way of salvation: "Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." As repentance and faith are vitally connected with the salvation of man, we cannot possibly overestimate their importance, or be too careful in our inquiry respecting their nature and necessity.

Our first inquiry shall be in reference to the nature of repentance. There are two words in the

Greek Testament rendered "repent:" *metamelomai* and *metanoeo*. Dr. Edward Robinson defines them as follows:

Metamelomai: "pr. *to transfer or change one's care;* hence *to change one's mind* or *purpose*, after having done any thing. Oftener with the idea of regret, sorrow, *to repent, to feel sorrow, remorse.*" This word occurs only six times in the New Testament. The leading idea of this word is "to feel sorrow," as in the following scripture: "For though I made you sorry with a letter, *I do not repent* (*metamelomai*), *though I did repent*" (*metemelomeen*).

Metanoeo: "pr. *to perceive afterward, to have an afterview;* henee *to change one's view, mind, purpose.* In New Testament, *to change one's mind, to repent*, implying the feeling of regret, sorrow." Here the leading idea is a *voluntary change of purpose* preceded by, and aecompanied with, a feeling of sorrow.

Repentance, then, is the voluntary act by which a sinful person, in whom the Spirit of God has wrought a "godly sorrow," turns from all his sins to God, as his Saviour and Lord. The person thus turning to God has a sense of his sin as offensive to God and defiling and endangering to his own soul. "For behold this selfsame thing, that ye sorrowed after a godly sort, what earefulness it wrought in you, yea, what elearing of yourselves, yea, what indignation, yea, what fear, yea, what vehement desire, yea, what zeal, yea, what revenge!"

God "has commanded all men everywhere to repent," and obedience to this command is essential to salvation. Repentance is something to be done, and not something to be received or experienced

simply. The performance of this duty calls out the active powers of the soul. It is true that God is said to "give repentance," but he only gives the motives and necessary conditions for it. Paul declares (Phil. ii. 13) that God works in us "both to will and to do of his good pleasure." By manifold agencies he works for us, and in us, to induce the mental and moral states or conditions necessary to right willing and right acting; but he neither wills for us nor acts for us. In our investigation of this subject, we propose to consider the different parts of the process involving both divine and human agency, by which a sinful person is enabled to turn to God in repentance. The first thing in this process that claims our attention is conviction.

Some critical divines have contended that conviction is a part of repentance. That this position is not correct is apparent, when we reflect that God has never promised to repent for any man, but has "commanded all men everywhere to repent." Conviction is a work which God performs by the agency of the Holy Spirit whom he has sent into the world, "to reprove (or convict) the world of sin," etc. God has never commanded man to convict himself, but he has commanded him to repent.

God convicts, man repents. We conclude, therefore, that conviction does not constitute a part of repentance. That which immediately follows conviction in the process of salvation is contrition, or "sorrow for sin." Is this sorrow a part of repentance? It has generally been accepted as such by divines. Knowing the number and ability of those who have accepted and are ready to defend this theory, we

would gladly leave it undisturbed, and thus avoid coming into conflict with many master-minds of the theological world, did we not believe that the interests of truth demand that we shall show that they have fallen, inadvertently doubtless, into error and inaccuracy of expression in reference to this point. We appeal to the laws of psychology and to the living oracles. By them we stand or fall.

Paul, speaking of this sorrow (2 Cor. vii. 10), calls it a "godly sorrow." Doubtless he so calls it because it is wrought in the heart by the Spirit of God, and has reference to God. "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight," is the language of the penitent.

Is this sorrow, wrought in the heart of the sinner by the Holy Spirit, an act or an effect? Unquestionably, it is an effect, of which the convicting grace of God is the cause; an emotional state, of which God is the author. It is neither the act of the man nor the immediate result of his act. It is simply the result of a divine act. How, then, can it constitute a part of that which God requires him to do when he commands him to repent? When "godly sorrow" has been wrought in the heart of a sinful person by the agency of the Holy Spirit, he then has the necessary means and ability for repenting. "Now I rejoice, not that ye were *made* sorry, but that ye sorrowed to repentance." Here the apostle draws a distinction between the sorrow felt and the repentance to which it led. "For ye were made sorry after a godly manner, that ye might receive damage by us in nothing. For godly sorrow work-

eth repentance to salvation not to be repented of but the sorrow of the world worketh death." (2 Cor. vii. 9, 10.)

Godly sorrow flows from conviction, and leads to repentance, and repentance leads to salvation. There can be no salvation without repentance and all its necessary antecedents; but, on the other hand, conviction, godly sorrow, and repentance, may all be experienced, and exhibited without salvation; for faith, or trust, in Jesus Christ as the Saviour must follow, in order to the attainment of this end. As the position we have taken in reference to this point is at variance with the generally accepted theory, we offer the following additional arguments in support of it:

The fact that God "has commanded all men everywhere to repent," is sufficient ground for inferring that repentance is a proper object of man's moral ability. If it is not, then has God commanded and required him to do an impossible thing, while at the same time he is exposed to the most fearful punishment in the event of a failure. The conclusion comes irresistibly that, if God is reasonable and just, repentance in its entirety is practicable to man.

The necessary antecedents, conviction and sorrow, having been given, man can, by the exertion of the will, repent; but he cannot in the same way cause a sorrowful state of mind and heart. He may, by a process of reflection, or by subjecting his mind to certain influences, occasion a feeling of sorrow; but when sorrow has been developed in the consciousness in this way, it cannot be regarded as the man's

voluntary act, nor indeed as an act of any kind, but only as an involuntary emotional state, resulting from a series of voluntary acts. The state of the heart is determined not by a direct volition, but by the objects under contemplation, or the influences exerted upon the mind. Paul mentions a "sorrow of the world that worketh death." Let us briefly analyze a case of this kind, and ascertain whether it agrees in its essential features with godly sorrow. A young man of ample fortune plunges into dissipation and extravagance. By his prodigality he speedily exhausts his estate, and no longer has the means for dissipation. He now discovers that he has squandered his fortune, impaired his health, ruined his character, and blasted his reputation. He stops in his wild career to review the past, and to contemplate the fearful and irreparable ruin which he has wrought. Now, what is the result? His mental and moral constitution is such that sorrow, grief, and remorse come infallibly and irresistibly; they do not wait until they are solicited to come, but rush unbidden to intrude themselves into the unwilling mind. His present painful state is a necessitated one, induced and determined by the reflections to which he has surrendered himself. Sorrow, as developed in his consciousness, is of the nature of an effect, and not of a cause. Just as a man coming into contact with physical causes or forces experiences a change of physical condition or state, so, coming into contact with moral and spiritual agencies, he experiences a changed moral condition or state.

Doubtless many persons, having been convicted

by the Spirit of God, and having felt sorrow on account of sin, have imagined, in consequence thereof, that they have repented, when really they have made no effort to meet the requirements of the gospel in this regard. Let us not be deceived: these do not constitute repentance—they are only designed to lead to it. The *convicted, sorrowing* sinner, in the fear of God, abandons all his sins, seeks the forgiving mercy of God, through Jesus Christ, "ceases to do evil, and learns to do well," and the work is accomplished. This act constitutes repentance.

It has generally been represented that reformation constitutes an essential part of repentance. This is not critically correct; for while it is true that reformation follows evangelical repentance, and is the fruit and evidence thereof, it cannot, in the nature of things, constitute a part of it, because its relation to repentance is that of effect to cause. If this relation did not exist, there are other important reasons why reformation should not be considered as a part of repentance.

Repentance may be accomplished in a very brief period of time; for a sinner, according to the teaching of the word of God, can repent as readily as he can believe, and he can believe without any delay. More time is requisite for a complete reformation than is necessary for the exercise of repentance and faith. To make reformation a part of repentance, and repentance a term or condition of faith, is to complicate and delay the process of salvation in such a way as to make it impracticable and uncertain in many cases where the Bible has

not so made it. The entire process, from its inception to its consummation, is as follows: First, conviction by the word and Spirit of God, from which flows contrition, or sorrow, followed by an active purpose, or resolve, upon the part of the sinner, to abandon forever all his sins, and to obey God in all things, evidencing itself continuously by an improved life.

"Faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." The Greek word rendered faith is "*pistis*," from the verb "*pēitho*." Dr. Robinson, in his Lexicon of the New Testament, defines it as follows: "*Faith, belief, trust*, pr. firm persuasion, confiding belief in the truth, veracity, reality of any person or thing." The Greek verb most frequently employed by the sacred writers to set forth the act act of believing, or trusting, is "*pistūo*," which means, according to Dr. Robinson, "*To have faith, to put faith in, to believe, to trust.*" "As to persons, *to have faith in, to believe in or on, to trust in.*" Having given the etymology of the word, we will endeavor to ascertain its entire Scripture meaning.

Faith is not an abstract entity existing in the store-house of God's grace, to be communicated to man without any agency of his, as the ravens brought food to Elijah while concealed by the brook Cherith. It can possibly have no existence in the abstract; it is the voluntary act of believing, *trusting*, and, in the nature of things, is dependent on the agency of the believer for its existence. Any theory rejecting this idea is absolutely irreconcilable with those scriptures which enjoin the exer-

cise of faith upon man as his solemn duty. Man is, by nature, in a state of unbelief, while the Bible declares that he cannot please God without faith. Our first inquiry will be in reference to the means employed by God to bring him to the exercise of faith. In Rom. iv. 14–17, the apostle writes: "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach except they be sent? as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things! But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? So then *faith cometh by hearing*, and hearing by the word of God." Again, John xx. 30, 31: "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but *these are written, that ye might believe* that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." The great system of salvation, wrought out by Jesus Christ, is made up of facts and truths which are recorded in the Holy Scriptures. Man must acquire a knowledge of these before he can accredit them. The Bible has been written, and the ministry instituted, for the purpose of communicating this knowledge to those who need it. This knowledge is absolutely necessary to the exercise of faith, but does not infallibly secure it. It is the chronological condition, but is not the logical or efficient cause, of faith. The necessity of this knowledge is

apparent from the scriptures already quoted: "How shall they believe in him *of whom they have not heard.*" It is obvious that a man cannot believe until he has heard, and it is certain that he may hear and not exercise faith. Again: "But these are written that ye might believe." The immediate result of hearing the word of God is an intellectual apprehension of its truth, and an assent of the mind to that truth. But is the persuasion, or belief, that results from "hearing the word of God," the faith that is enjoined upon man, as vitally connected with his salvation? Many contend that it is. A mistake at this point may be fatal. The honest inquirer after truth will proceed cautiously in settling a question of such vital importance.

The facts recorded in the Scriptures concerning Jesus of Nazareth, his birth, life, work, death, resurrection, and ascension, constitute an important part of the evidence by which his claims are sustained. When these are presented to the mind for examination, and are clearly apprehended by the intellect, there follows, as an effect flowing from its cause, a mental conviction of their truth, and of the truth of the doctrines which they were designed to support. The mind yields an involuntary assent to them.

It is philosophically true that there is a fixed relation between evidence and belief, the belief being necessarily determined by the evidence. This is the ground of our responsibility for our opinions and beliefs. If it were otherwise, the embassador of Jesus Christ would have no sure *data* by which

to determine his course. He could not possibly tell whether the facts and truths of the gospel, presented by him to-day with such grand results, would be equally potent on to-morrow. The laws governing the operations of the human mind are not capricious, but steady and uniform.

The simple assent of the mind, or a mental conviction of the truth of the doctrines and reality of the facts recorded in the Bible, resulting from an investigation of the evidences by which they are supported, cannot be the faith that justifies the penitent sinner. It is involuntary, and therefore necessitated. The process of investigation is voluntary, but the opinion, or belief, resulting therefrom is not, for it is determined and fixed by the evidence before the mind. The influence of that evidence cannot be resisted or modified by a direct act of volition. The constitution of the mind of man is such, and the evidences of Christianity are of such a character, that when they are brought distinctly in view of the mind, its assent is infallibly secured.

Jesus Christ is the light of the world. His life is the light that "shineth in darkness." It is as clear, effulgent, and resistless as the noon-day sun. A man born and reared in a subterranean dungeon might be utterly destitute of a knowledge of the existence of the material sun, while another, viewing him through a partially opaque medium, might be in doubt as to his real effulgence and glory; but when they behold him, without obscuration, in his meridian splendor, they are irresistibly impressed with his majesty and power. The reason

why all men do not assent to the truths of the Bible is not because they are not sustained by indubitable evidence, but beeause *some* men "love darkness rather than light," and willfully refuse to give them the eandid and impartial examination whieh their merits and importanee demand. "And this is the eondemnation, that light is eome into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, *because* their deeds were evil." "For every one that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved." "But he that doeth truth eometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God." The writings of those who rejeet the Bible and oppose Christianity indicate a very limited, imperfeet, and partial acquaintanee with the Holy Seriptures, while at the same time some of them eontain the most exquisite eulogies upon the eharaeter and teaching of Jesus Christ to be found anywhere. We infer, from the faets already presented, that the simple assent of the mind, or "*the belief of the truth*" of the facts and doetrines of the Bible, is not the faith of the *heart*, by whieh the repentant sinner reeeives remission of sins. The faith that works by love and purifies the heart is not the belief of facts, nor the belief of doctrines simply, but an unfaltering relianee upon Jesus Christ as a personal Saviour. The faith which the New Testament requires in order to salvation includes not merely an assent of the mind to the gospel as historically and doctrinally true, not merely a conviction of its necessity, excellence, and suitableness, but a full and firm relianee upon the sufficiency and power of

Jesus as the Saviour. It combines assent with reliance, belief with trust. The belief and assent may be separate from the reliance and trust, but the latter cannot exist without the former. The faith by which "the elders obtained a good report" united trust with the assent of the mind to the truth of God's revelations. "Our fathers trusted in thee, and were not confounded." "Have faith in God"—he is the proper object of trust—not the revelation he has made; this only gives the necessary information in reference to man's salvation. The faith of God's elect goes beyond the mere facts and doctrines of the gospel, and takes hold of Jesus Christ as a suitable and sufficient Saviour. It is an act in which the intellect, affections, and will, are all involved.

The Scriptures clearly teach that there are degrees in faith, and that the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit is vouchsafed unto man to enable him, in the exercise of the ability which God giveth, to "believe to the salvation of his soul." In Matt. vi. 30, Jesus addresses his disciples, saying: "O ye of little faith?" In reference to the centurion's faith, he says: "I have not found *so great* faith, no, not in Israel." If there is *little* faith, and *great* faith, then it must consist of degrees. In Rom. i. 17, we read: "For therein is the righteousness of God revealed *from faith to faith.*" This doubtless means from one degree of faith to another. The following scriptures indicate that the gracious influence of the Holy Spirit may be obtained, to assist in the exercise of faith: "Jesus said unto him, If thou canst believe all,

things are possible to him that believeth. And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, Lord, I believe; *help thou mine unbelief.*" In Luke xvii. 5, we hear the disciples praying: "Lord, increase our faith." These scriptures not only imply that faith may be increased, but authorize prayer as a proper means for the attainment of this end. In 1 Cor. xii. 9, faith is mentioned as one of the gifts of the Holy Spirit: "To another faith, by the same Spirit." The Bible not only presents prayer as a means by which faith may be increased, but also as a means by which it may be sustained. In Luke xxii. 31, Jesus addresses Peter, saying, "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he might sift you as wheat: but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."

Having examined repentance and faith, respectively, in reference to their nature, we shall now proceed to consider them relatively. Which holds priority in the plan of salvation, and ought to be the first subject of evangelical preaching? Those who hold and teach that the mere assent of the mind, or "the belief of testimony," is the faith which the Scriptures require in connection with salvation, earnestly contend that faith necessarily and uniformly precedes repentance in the process by which a sinner becomes a child of God. That the assent of the mind to the truths of the Bible, or at least such of them as are vitally connected with the salvation of the soul, must precede repentance, we are willing to admit; but that the

trust-element of faith, which is an essential one, may exist before repentance is, in the very nature of things, an impossibility.

A sinner cannot trust in Jesus Christ for salvation until he has resolved to be saved; and that resolve, with all it implies, contains the real essence of repentance.

It is apparent that the sinner must be informed, to some extent, in reference to the existence of God, the sinful and lost condition of man, and the salvation that is by Jesus Christ, before he can or will repent. Possessing the necessary information, and anxiously desiring salvation, he, with grief and hatred for all his sins, solemnly resolves to abandon them, and immediately "ceases to do evil," and begins "to do well," when his repentance is accomplished. He then trusts in Jesus Christ as a personal Saviour, and God, for Christ's sake, pardons him.

Let the case of the sinner be represented by that of a sick man. By observing the distinctive characteristics of his disease, and consulting the books of an eminent medical writer and practitioner, he is enabled to correctly diagnosticate in reference thereto, and becomes convinced that his malady will prove fatal if not timely remedied. The physical state of the sick man is analagous to the moral state of the convicted sinner, who has been made to see and feel, by the motions of his own sinful heart and the word and Spirit of God, that he is a condemned and dying man.

Just as the suffering sick man desires ease and health, so the sorrowing penitent sinner desires

peace and pardon. The sick man examines the writings of the physician, consults persons who have been restored to health by his remedies, until he is satisfied of the ability of the physician, and the efficacy of his remedies. His confidence in both is unbounded. Here is mental conviction—the belief of testimony. His desire for health moves him to resolve to be cured. This resolve includes every thing essential to his restoration, both of a positive and of a negative character. It is an active purpose not only to do, but to refrain from doing, as the physician may direct. This resolve is analagous to the act of repentance. One important step remains to be taken before the desired object is realized; and it is the one that contains the trust-element, or principle. The diseased man now goes to the physician and submits to his treatment, firmly relying upon his skill for health and life. He surrenders himself to the man of healing with an unfaltering confidence in his ability and integrity. This is trust—this is faith.

The laws of psychology imperatively demand the order for which we contend in reference to the exercise of repentance and faith. A man has only to observe, carefully, the operations of his own mind and heart to be fully assured of this fact. The philosophy of the plan of salvation consists in its complete adaptedness to the constitution and aptitude of man as a subject of God's moral government. The Holy Spirit infracts no law of man's nature in exerting his gracious influences upon him. To require the sinner to trust in the

Saviour before he has repented, is to require him to reverse the subjective laws of mental and moral action, which the Creator has ordained for his well-being.

From the very time when man first became a sinner it has been obligatory upon him to repent. Hence repentance has always been the first subject of evangelical preaching.

While the "doctrine of a Christ" has always occupied a prominent place in the system of religion ordained of God, and men were required to accept it as an essential part thereof, under all the former dispensations, no one could reasonably be required to believe in *Jesus as the Christ* until he was manifested to the world as the Saviour of men. When John came as his forerunner, to prepare the way for him, the burden of his preaching was repentance. "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." John baptized those who came to him, thus obligating them not only to *repent for the remission of sins*, but to believe on Jesus as the Christ when he should be manifested to them. The repentance was for the remission of sins, not the baptism.

John's baptism was called "the baptism of repentance" because it looked to and required repentance. The baptism afterward practiced by the apostles looked to and required faith, and might with propriety be called the "baptism of

faith for the remission of sins." It is *the faith* in the name of Jesus, or reliance upon him, that secures the "remission of sins," and not the baptism.

Repentance is the foundation-principle of the active religious life and experience. In Heb. vi. 1, we read: "Therefore leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto perfection; not laying again the *foundation of repentance* from dead works, and of faith toward God." When repentance and faith are mentioned connectedly in the Scriptures, they always stand in this particular order. Faith is never put before repentance. Mark the following scriptures, in addition to those already noticed: Mark i. 15, "Repent ye, and believe the gospel." Matt. xxi. 32, "Ye believed him not; . . . and ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, *that ye might believe him.*" The latter passage presents repentance as the *necessary* antecedent and logical condition of belief, or faith. This phraseology is somewhat remarkable if it does not present the true order of these moral exercises as they occur in the process of turning from sin to holiness, and from the service of Satan to the service of God. That the order for which we contend is the true one is fully attested by the consciousness of every truly converted person. There is a perfect agreement between the objective and subjective evidence on this point.

The inspired Scriptures teach emphatically the absolute necessity of repentance and faith. In Luke xiii. 3, we read: "Except ye repent, ye shall

all likewise perish." And in Mark xvi. 16, we read: "He that believeth not shall be damned." The necessity of repentance is apparent from the very nature of sin. What is sin? It is direct rebellion against God; it is a rejection of his authority, a renunciation of allegiance to him, and a surrender of all the powers of the soul to evil and Satan, the great enemy of the Lord Jehovah. Sin is inherently and essentially polluting and destructive in its nature and tendency; it brings into the soul derangement and contamination, and, if not counteracted and subdued, works inevitably the complete and everlasting ruin thereof; it disqualifies for the worship and service of God. Man cannot, at the same time, serve the devil and God—it is his bounden duty to love and obey God; but with a "carnal mind" that "is enmity to God," and a conscience defiled with sin, he is neither qualified for the service of God here nor for the enjoyment of heaven hereafter. He must renounce "the works of darkness" before he can hope to escape their consequences. Sin, left to run its course, inevitably terminates in death.

When the sinner repents, changes his purpose and course, he needs the forgiving mercy of God to cancel all his past sins, and the presence and power of the Holy Spirit to regenerate and sanctify his nature, and to help him to work out his own salvation "with fear and trembling." These may be obtained by trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ; they cannot be obtained in any other way. "He that believeth not shall be damned."

Let the following case illustrate the necessity of

repentance and faith, and its philosophy: A man has inherited a loathsome disease, of unquestionable fatality, for which there is but one known remedy. This remedy may be readily obtained, and a cure effected thereby. It is the man's duty to procure this infallible remedy at once, and he really desires to be healed. Every moment of delay imperils his very existence. But instead of procuring this remedy immediately, he defers it from day to day, while the probabilities of his restoration to soundness of health are hourly diminishing. Not only is he, at a fearful risk, deferring this matter, so vitally important to him, but he is pursuing the very course of life that is best calculated to augment the power of his disease, and hasten his dissolution. Instead of being temperate in all things, he is intemperate in the use of every thing. Instead of carefully guarding himself against the inclemencies of the weather, he foolishly exposes his person to all the rigors of the climate and season; and while he ought to cautiously husband his physical resources, he is improvidently expending them in excessive toil. A physician fully comprehending his case, with great solicitude, goes to him, points out the nature and tendency of his disease, remonstrates with him against the course he has adopted, and finally offers him a safe prescription, assuring him that multiplied thousands have been restored to perfect health by its timely use. Now, mark the folly of the man. He admits the existence and virulence of the disease, but excuses himself from any action in the matter upon the ground of the fact that it was transmitted to him by his progenitors, and its development in

his system was unavoidable. The physician reminds him that the all-important subject demanding attention and action is not the origin of the disease, but the fatal character of it, and the practicability of it's speedy removal. He again calls his attention to his habitual vices and excesses, and urges him, by all the interests involved in this matter, to abandon them at once, and begin the practice of virtue and temperance. The man replies by pleading the strength of appetite and habit, and the extreme difficulty of effecting a change in life, when held so completely within their power, and refuses to follow the directions given him. The physician, after contemplating the extremity of his case for a time, deliberately addresses him, saying: "How will you escape if you neglect this great remedy? There is no other remedy given in the *materia medica*, and among physicians, whereby you may be saved. Except you change your purpose and take this remedy, you '*shall perish.*' He that taketh this remedy and is healed, shall live; he that taketh it not, shall die." The physician simply announces the termination of the course which the sick man has adopted. He alone, and not the physician, is responsible for the result. The physician endeavored to prevent this fearful result, but failed because the man, in the perversity of his heart, rejected all his offers, and refused to eoöperate with him in his attempt to secure his physical salvation. Now, what shall be thought of this dying man when he, after having rejected the advice and remedy offered, turns upon the physician and denounces him as hard-hearted and unreasonable, simply because he has announced

that, owing to the constitution of things, certain effects will flow from certain causes? Shall the physician be blamed because he comprehends the nature and tendency of the disease, and has the candor to announce an unfavorable prognosis? Certainly not. The patient alone is blameworthy. For while it is true that the disease was transmitted, and not induced by any voluntary act of his, yet he is responsible for its ultimate consequences, because the means by which he might have escaped them were offered to him, and he ungratefully rejected them.

The sinner is morally diseased. "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head, there is no soundness in it, but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores." By every sin and transgression which he commits, he is increasing the virulence of this hereditary disease, and hastening his destruction. "Death worketh" in him. His own soul contains the elements of its destruction. And because every act of sin is an act of rebellion against God, he is under condemnation. "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the only-begotten Son of God." There is but one way by which this condemned and dying man may escape the damnation of hell, and obtain life and salvation. That way is, "Repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ."

Infidels have represented this way as being too rigid, especially that part of it which makes faith in Jesus essential to salvation. They contend that the position that a man whose character has received

the approval of the world shall be damned, for the simple lack of faith in Jesus Christ, is arbitrary, unreasonable, and inconsistent with the merciful character of God. This opinion results from an improper view of the subject. There is a profound philosophy, that far transcends the wisdom of men, in this system of pardon. The first thing to be accomplished is the removal of every cause and influence that acts unfavorably upon the morally-diseased soul, and the correction of all the irregularities that characterize its abnormal state. What is better adapted to the accomplishment of this end than repentance, by which the sinner "ceases to do evil, and learns to do well?" But after this much has been effected, the disease still remains. The power of God only can remove it. If allowed to remain, it will, under the most favorable circumstances, terminate fatally. The repentant sinner, conscious of his sinfulness, and anxiously desiring salvation, feels his utter inability to extricate himself from the power and thralldom of sin. The language of his heart is, "What must I do to be saved?" The answer comes from heaven, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and *thou shalt be saved.*" By simple trust in Jesus Christ as his Saviour, he realizes the pardoning love and sanctifying grace of God. Here is a "faith that works by love, and purifies the heart." How simple, and yet how grand and philosophical, is this system of pardon! Behold the wisdom and goodness of God in appointing faith as the condition of pardon, or justification, to the penitent sinner! The guilty, unworthy, condemned, and dying sinner cannot save himself; but God says to him, Trust

my Son; he is worthy; he is able, and "thou shalt be saved." "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end (in order that) the promise (of salvation) might be sure to all the seed: not to that only which is of the law (those who have conformed to the external duties of religion, and received the sacraments thereof), but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham" (those who believe in unbaptism, and without external conformity to the law of the Church). As Abraham was justified, or pardoned, by faith "in uncircumcision," so may the penitent now be justified in unbaptism; for Abraham "is the father of us all." Simple faith is the ground of our relationship.

We have represented repentance and faith, in their essence, as voluntary acts. They are not mere momentary, but continuous, acts. In repentance there must not only a purpose be formed to "cease to do evil, and to learn to do well," but it must abide in and actuate the soul through all subsequent life; it must become a settled rule of action. So faith is not merely a momentary trust in the Saviour, but an abiding reliance upon the God of all grace for every essential good. "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him: rooted and built up in him, and established in the faith, as ye have been taught." We receive him by faith, so we are to walk in him by faith. Hence the declaration, "We walk by faith, not by sight." The Apostle Paul, writing in reference to his Christian life, describes it as follows: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live

in the flesh I live by the *faith* of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me."

The man in whom a steady purpose to do no wrong, but to do the right, has become an established rule of life, and who unfalteringly trusts, at all times, in God the Father, and in his only-begotten Son Jesus Christ, and in the Holy Spirit, for wisdom and grace, for life and salvation, will be eternally saved; but the man who has not this purpose and this trust will inevitably be damned. He himself will be responsible for his damnation, because he has rejected the means of salvation which infinite wisdom has provided and infinite goodness offered.

THE NAME, WONDERFUL.

BY THE REV S. X. HALL.

"His name shall be called Wonderful."—Isa. ix. 6.

IN the universe—the vast, boundless, limitless universe, where all is wonderful, the universe itself the most wonderful of all—there yet exists a Wonder which preëminently transcends all. And when this beautiful world of ours—beautiful still, though marred by sorrow and tainted by sin—shall have been dissolved in the fires of the last day, and its grandeur, glory, and history shall have become a thing of yesterday, this Wonder will remain the object of admiring and adoring love, lasting as eternity. Concerning this Wonder, Isaiah said, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful."

The distinguished Personage brought to view in this passage is undoubtedly the divine Redeemer, the Saviour of men, the God-man. His character, beyond all dispute, is unique—it is without precedent, without parallel. He is a child born, with reference to his human nature; but he is a son given, with reference to his divine nature, being given as well as born. Of course, the Godhead could not be born of a woman; this would be a

moral impossibility. The Godhead was from everlasting, and is to everlasting. As a child he was born, as a son he was given; as a matter of prophecy, "the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful." His name shall be expressive of his character and his works. In the most emphatic sense, he is a wonderful Being, and the work he came to accomplish is a wonderful work. The statement is not here made, by the evangelical prophet, that God the Eternal Father has given him the name of Wonderful, but "his name shall be called Wonderful." His name is at the present time called Wonderful by multiplied thousands and millions of Adam's race, who are now journeying across this hemisphere of human grief; and during all time, and throughout the countless cycles of eternity, men, and angels, and glorified spirits, will call him by his right name: "His name shall be called Wonderful."

God, my friends, has implanted in the human heart a love of the wonderful; and not only has he inspired the sentiment, but, in countless forms, he has met it. He has clothed the universe with the wonderful. Turn the eye where we may, it lights upon some object of wonder, which, but for the blinding and stupefying power of sin, would awaken the exclamation from every lip, "How great is his beauty! how great is his power!" To a thoughtful man there are indeed many, many wonders. Every thing in the character of God is wonderful. His self-existence is an amazing thing when you give your attention to it—existence without any beginning, without any cause, behind all cause, ante-

cedent to all eausation. God cannot remember any beginning; his own mind can go back to no period when he was not just what he is now. Connected with this thought is this fact: there was a long period, that we must call infinite, in which God dwelt alone. Go back as far as human conception will permit—and that is a measured period—and behind all that stretches away in the dim distance a period which is infinite: that is wonderful. And God's eternity, intimately connected with this very thought, reaching back without any beginning, and reaching forward without any end: that is wonderful.

If I could, by any process whatever, accurately and truthfully aseertain the ages of every man and woman residing in the city of Lexington at the present time, some would say twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, sixty, seventy, and possibly some would even say eighty; it would, however, be a rare thing for any man to be found in this or any other city who had seen one hundred years. But, my friends, the time will come in our future when, if we tell our ages in the language of earth's arithmetic, we shall say, "I am a million of years old to-day;" or, "I have seen ten millions;" or, if other methods of eomputation be used, as many ages, or cycles of ages, as sands upon the ocean's shore. And even then we shall be young; for, in view of the future that stretches out before us, we shall have but just entered the morning of existence. This is very wonderful; and these thoughts will grow upon the man who entertains them.

God's power is wonderful. The savage, the uneultivated man, only looks at it in some of the out-

croppings, some of the more palpable and rough—shall I say?—manifestations, as in the rocking earthquake and in the raging cataract; but the cultivated man sees the silent power of heat lifting from the oceans vast quantities of water, carrying it away in the heavens without noise, and depositing it again, in gentle rains, and dews, and snows, upon the mountains and the high places, to fill the rivers. This is wonderful; and, when we have taken pains to grasp all we can of this, it is just a little of the power of God. David said, "When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers." The expression, "the work of thy fingers," seems intended to show that, even in originating the heavens, he did not understand God to have put forth his strength at all. And then when you consider the power of God in creation, how wonderful is the same? The strongest man in the world can approach no more nearly the creation of an atom than the most helpless infant in the world. This is something entirely distinct from all our conceptions of power; we cannot conceive what it is—we simply know the fact. And when you consider that the creative energy of God may have been in exercise for an infinite period—that as far back as imagination can go this creative energy may have been operating, bringing worlds into existence as rapidly as the sparks fly from the furnace—this is wonderful.

The wisdom of God, in thousands of adaptations, to a thoughtful man, is a matter of great wonder. His wisdom in governing the world is wonderful—in controlling the myriads of counter-forces and opposing influences, and bringing out results just the

contrary from those intended by the parties. This is wisdom amazing and wonderful. Thus we see that every thing connected with the character of God is wonderful.

But the incarnation of God is the wonder of wonders—the wonder of the universe. All other demonstrations of God's power and wisdom, goodness and glory, pale before the splendor of this marvelous, this wonderful, event. In view of this profound stoop of Deity, this unique and costly exhibition of God's power and love to man, could the incarnated One wear a title more expressive or more appropriate than this: "His name shall be called Wonderful."

We proceed, therefore, to attempt an unfolding, in some faint measure, of this wonder of wonders. To see it spiritually, to experience it savingly, is of more worth to us than to gaze upon and understand the greatest wonders in the material universe. What if the *arcana* of all natural and scientific marvel were opened to us, and we could understand all mysteries, and all knowledge, and all tongues, and yet saw nothing to awaken our astonishment in God's greatest wonder, nothing to inspire our admiration in God's greatest beauty, nothing to incite our love in God's most precious gift—even him whose name is Wonderful? it had been better for us to have lived and died with the idiot's stare and the madman's frenzy.

In the incarnation a new series of wonders arise—a new class of amazing facts bursts upon our view. Here is the self-existence, to which we have alluded, combining with helpless and dependent life—this

eternity with a creature of time—this omnipotent power with helplessness. How strange the combination! This infinite wisdom becomes wedded to ignorance that begins to learn; this amazing exaltation is married to deep degradation; this infinite dominion combines with degrading servitude; unspeakable beatitudes mingle with unspeakable anguish. Now, these antagonisms and opposites, that no mind would have conceived of—these paradoxes, it would seem—exist together. How wonderful! Immortality married to death, and death springing into life and immortality. This is, indeed, wonderful. A child born, a helpless infant, a son given, and yet dominion resting upon his shoulders, "and his name shall be called Wonderful." How amazing and wonderful are these minglings! How unexpected to all our conceptions are such events coming together! He who proposes to be our Saviour—God over all blessed forever—becomes part and parcel of ourselves; he looks upon human sorrow and suffering through human eyes; he listens to human woe through human ears; feels for human condition through a human heart, and enters into deep sympathy with all humanity through human sympathy. This is an adaptation to our wants, to our weaknesses, and to our misery, that is amazing and wonderful. It is not, as some have imagined, in order that God could feel for us or sympathize with us. He that formed the eye, shall he not see; he that formed the ear, shall he not hear; he that attuned the heart to all the heart's nicest loves and tenderest emotions, shall he be destitute of these loves and emotions?

Jesus, the Wonderful, became incarnate, that he might come nearer to us than we could otherwise bear to have him come—that we might become more strongly impressed with God's love and mercy than we could otherwise be impressed. God manifested in the flesh, he became the Son of man, not the son of any man; for in his human nature our Saviour was preëminently above all that was born, the prophecy from the beginning of the seed of the woman being fulfilled—and yet, by way of preëminent distinction above all that was born, he is the Son of man, the Son of all humanity, part and parcel of the great mass of humanity, and related, by a fellow-feeling and a common sympathy, with all that is human. He must come in some nation, so he came from the Jewish nation; but he is no more a Jew, in any distinctive feature that can be named in his character, than Greek or Roman, or any other nationality in the world; and if you will take the pains to gather up what I am pleased to call the resultant of any national trait in the world, you will find it in Jesus Christ, without its abuse and without its sinful application.

Now, what a wonderful adaptation there is in all this to human wants! We feel it difficult to exhibit that close sympathy toward a stranger and a foreigner which we feel toward an acquaintance and a citizen of our own nation, having been brought up differently, with different habits, different scenery, and the whole surroundings different; we cannot feel the beating of their hearts against our heart, as we can where we have been brought up under similar circumstances, and had every thing alike. But

with Jesus it is quite different. Wherever his person and character can be understood, there is a felt adaptation. The poor Esquimau in his miserable hut of snow and ice, the untutored African upon the burning sand, the jealous Chinaman, and the proud, conceited Greek, whenever the name of Jesus is fully before him, and the soul is fully awake to its own wants, sees that Jesus is life from the dead—"the Wonderful One." "We have known Christ after the flesh," said an inspired apostle, "yet henceforth know we him so no more." We do not know him as a Jew any more; we know him now as the Son of man, as the Saviour of our ruined race, as the great representative of the human race; we know him as having something in common with every thing that is human; we know him as being more nearly related to human beings than any human being is to another, feeling every throb—shall I say every emotion?—and every anxiety of every human creature, with an interest, a depth, and a nearness of sympathy that no mother ever felt for her child. He is our Head—he is our Life; the Church is his body. "His name shall be called Wonderful." These impressive facts conclusively demonstrate the sympathy and the close intimacy of the Lord Jesus with our helpless humanity. Now, all this is wonderful—O how wonderful! It is an amazing, a wonderful, provision for human want. I well know it is the subject of many a foolish jest; I know also that to the heart that is awake, and to the soul that sees its need, it is as life from the dead.

My friends, all humanity cries out for an incarnation. Did you ever think that the very idols which the poor, blind heathen have prepared throughout the whole world, wherever the gospel has not gone, are the product of the groaning there is in the human heart after God incarnate? They are groping in the dark, and yet they are reaching out after the light of heaven. It is the want of humanity reaching out after something that is more tangible, more accessible, and more within the grasp and conception of human character than an invisible, intangible, inappreciable, all-pervading, and infinite Spirit. It is strange that men shut themselves off in a vacuum when this wonderful provision is brought to them—God manifested in the flesh. "His name shall be called Wonderful." Thus the Lord Jesus, the Wonderful One, allied himself to all that is human, to all that belongs essentially to human nature. Are you feeble? Christ was weak; are you poor? Christ battled with poverty. Are you despised and reputed to be mean? Christ was rejected, and was esteemed a root out of the dry ground; are you tempted? Christ was set up as a target for Satan's fiery darts, and the archer sorely grieved him, and shot at him, and hated him; are you a child of sorrow? Jesus was a man of grief; are you without means, friendless, solitary, homeless? all this was Jesus, and all this he was that he might show his wonderful union with his saints in all that belonged to them, that the Head might be one with the body, and all the members of that body be conformed to him, their Head. Behold a continuous, never-ceasing stream of sympathy from

the Wonderful One with all his people, in all their individual and collective circumstances, meandering like a pure, silvery stream throughout this fallen world, reaching, penetrating, soothing the remotest and most obscure place of gloom and sorrow where dwells a sinner ransomed with his precious blood. Cease not to remember this wonderful union of him who is the Wonderful. Other ties may weaken, other bonds be severed, other unions be dissolved, but this one never! "His name shall be called Wonderful."

Christ Jesus is wonderful in the work he came to perform, and the manner in which he performed it. The works of God are manifold, and are absolutely perfect; but his great, his greatest, his masterwork, is the salvation of his people. Here he has unveiled his whole being; all his divine attributes are revealed, harmonized, and glorified in this wondrous scheme of saving sinners. "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved." Jesus said of himself, "I am the light of the world." He was the sent of God, the great "Teacher come from God." And in this work he was wonderful, and the manner in which he performed it was wonderful. "Never man spake like this man." Such was the testimony of persons who could not for a moment be suspected of partiality, and would never have uttered this eulogy if it had not been wrested from them by an admiration the expression of which they were utterly unable to suppress. "Never man spake like this man." Never mortal had such doctrines to deliver, and never mortal taught in so solemn and impressive, yet so tender

and affectionate, a manner. His life on earth was a life of love, his teaching a system of love; his all-seeing eye penetrated the hearts of those whom he instructed, and saw, most clearly, all their secret springs. With wisdom unequaled, he adapted his instructions to the people, imparting the most exalted wisdom to the unlearned. Unlike the philosophers of Rome and Greece, who confined their instruction to the educated classes, he descended amongst the masses of the people, and made them wiser than pagan philosophers. As an evidence of his Messiahship, he said, "The poor have the gospel preached to them." He manifested wonderful skill in striking and moving the consciences of wicked men, and arousing them from their sinful security. Mark his answer to those who, though themselves most vile and ungodly, brought to him a woman taken in adultery, and said, "Moses in the law commanded us, that such should be stoned: but what sayest thou?" He perfectly understood the vileness of their motives, and he absolutely comprehended the vileness of their lives. After they had importuned him for an answer, he said, "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." "And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last." Here we have an example, and a very impressive one, of the manner in which Christ Jesus performed his work. The Gospels contain other examples equally striking and impressive.

Wonderful, too, is the God-man in his death—wonderful, transcendently wonderful, the spectacle

of essential Life condescending to die. To see him who had given life to all sentient beings—and from whom, at the very moment that he yielded up the ghost, a stream of vital power was flowing into every creature that had breath—paling and stiffening in death, was indeed a sight of wonder to the universe. The history of our world, if faithfully, accurately written, would contain the records of many wonderful events; but the death of Christ would of all be the most wonderful. I feel authorized to say that no occurrence equally astonishing and equally important has taken place in the universe. The cross of Calvary may well attract the attention and monopolize the contemplations of all worlds. On that cross the Lord of glory expired; there infinitely precious blood was shed; and there we learn more of the character and purposes of God than from all other sources combined.

The death of Christ was wonderful in its results. It touched sin, and it was cleansed; it touched the curse, and it became a blessing; it touched itself, and it died; it touched the grave, and it yielded back its prisoner; it touched the gate of paradise and the kingdom of heaven was opened to all believers. This was the "corn of wheat which fell into the ground and died," and which, in virtue of that death, "brought forth much fruit." (John xii. 24.) Now, is it not wonderful that Jesus should condescend to die the ignominious death of the cross for his inveterate enemies—for fallen beings already condemned to death? and is it not wonderful, too, that that one death should have given so perfect satisfaction to divine justice as to have

emancipated countless millions from its eternal punishment? Penitent sinners, humble believers, that death was for you; for you the crimson blood, for you the dying agony, for you the expiring convulsion, for you the yielding up the ghost. Come, and gather the sacred, precious fruit that grows upon the cross of Calvary; lift your believing hand, tremulous though it be, and pluck the bending clusters of pardon, and peace, and joy, and hope, and triumph. Jesus, the Wonderful, died for you, died in your stead, died that you might never die. Accepting in faith this wondrous fact, that Christ died for your sins, you shall pass from death unto life, and never see death. O the wonders that spring from this wonderful death of Jesus! Never shall we reach the end of them. All is peace with God now; and now that a most sure atonement has been made by the suffering and death of Jesus for sinners, comfort flows into the troubled conscience, and all is peace between God and the believing soul. Tremble not, then, believing friend, at the prospect of death. Jesus will not suffer the deepening shadows that drape the margin of the cold, dark river to hide him from your view; he who died for you will meet you there, and, taking your hand of faith in his hand of love, will gently lead you over, and all the shining ones that line the shore will welcome you on the other side.

The death of Jesus was wonderful in the love that induced it. St. John, the loving and beloved apostle, accustomed to lean his weary, aching head upon the compassionate bosom of the gentle,

loving Jesus, gave utteranee to these impressive words: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." Note the phrase, "Herein is love;" as if he had said, "Are you looking out for some eommanding proof of love? look at the cross of Christ—look at the plan of redemption. Here it is. This is love indeed—love divine, love transeending all other love, love stronger than death." And, again, the same apostle exelaims, in language of perfect admiration, "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us." As if he had said, "Ye angels, behold; ye swift-winged messengers, behold; and man—immortal man—behold, and say, Was there ever love like this?" And this wondrous and matchless love seems to transcend and eclipse all other wonders; it was the first and eternal link in the golden chain lowered from the highest throne in heaven down to the lowest depth of earth. That Christ should love us was the beginning of wonders. When we endeavor to eomprehend that love—measure it, fathom it, seale it, and learn that it has heights we cannot reach, depths we eannot sound, lengths and breadths we cannot measure—we are prepared for every wonder belonging to and springing from him who is Wonderful. Such love, such infinite love, such divine love, such everlasting love, sueh redeeming love, such dying love, is an ocean whose eternal waves waft into our fallen world every wonder of God and of heaven.

Let all the world fall down and know
That none but God such love can show.

Thus love led the Saviour from the throne to the manger—the garden—the eross. And this love fixed its tenacious grasp on sinners. St. Paul said, "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus eame into the world to save sinners; of whom I am ehief." (1 Tim. i. 15.) It was not the love of friends that induced the Saviour to die, but the love of enemies. This fact must forever peculiarize the love of Christ, and render it wonderful. Who can eonceive the strength of this love? It was so strong as to lead him to make saerifiees, the magnitude of which no finite mind can ever appreciate; it prompted him to lay aside his glory and his crown; it indueed him to die. We judge of the ardor of love by what it leads its possessor to do for the welfare of those loved. Now, test the Saviour's love by this eriterion. He saw that he eould not seeure the salvation of sinners without eoming down from heaven, and dying on the eross. He might have ereated a world for every redeemed sinner with infinitely more ease than he procured salvation. Worlds are made by words; salvation is bought with blood—blood divine. Our Redeemer "traveled in the greatness of his strength" when he passed through the seenes of the garden and the eross; and never was his strength so fully tested. Love influeneed him to do all this. Now, was not his death wonderful in the love that induced it?

The manner in which the Saviour's death oeeurred renders it wonderful. He, who went about doing good, was betrayed into the hand of sinners —betrayed by a professed diseiple. Now, surely,

this is very remarkable—very wonderful. Who would have supposed that the covetous principle could get such possession of the heart of Judas as to make him act the traitor for thirty pieces of silver? Jesus, it will be remembered, was apprehended as an evil-doer; he was charged with blasphemy and sedition. The charge of blasphemy, I suppose, was intended to excite the Jews—that of sedition, the Romans. Both Jews and Romans, however, acted freely in the death of Jesus. Pilate was selfishness incarnate. But notwithstanding the wickedness of the Jews and Romans in procuring the death of Christ, he died voluntarily. The victim went willingly to the sacrificial altar; it was his choice to die. Now, do not all these considerations, taken together, prove the Saviour's death to have been a wonderful event?

The death of Christ was wonderful in its accompanying circumstances. The earth quaked, the rocks rent asunder, the vail of the temple was torn "in twain from the top to the bottom," the graves were opened, the sun concealed his bright face, and darkness covered the earth from the sixth to the ninth hour. These were sympathizing nature's impressive attestations to the wonderfulness of that great, that grand event—the death of Christ.

The death of Christ is wonderful in the influences resulting from it. It gloriously unveils the perfections of the divine character. More of God is to be seen in the cross than anywhere else in the universe. In the cross the divine attributes shine forth in harmonious and eternal splendor. Wisdom, holiness, justice, and love appear in all their glory

It makes God just in the justification of those who believe in Jesus. The reason is, the atoning death of Christ magnified the violated law of God, sustained its dignity, and vindicated its majesty. In consequence of this, mercy is extended to sinners consistently with law and justice.

It places our apostate race in a salvable condition. The possibility of the salvation of sinners is unquestionable. Law and justice interpose no objection to the salvation of any sinner who trusts in Christ. The gospel is preached to every creature. None need be lost; all are invited to pardon, and to a home in heaven.

It secures the actual salvation of countless myriads. John, in vision, saw before the throne a multitude which no man could number. No man can take the census of heaven's redeemed population; it is so great as to render an enumeration a happy impracticability. Now, is not the death of Christ wonderful in these and ten thousand other influences resulting from the same?

Jesus is wonderful in his resurrection. This was the head-stone of the sacred edifice of our redemption. For this reason, after his resurrection, the apostles went forth preaching not so much the fact of the Redeemer's death as the fact of his resurrection. "And with great power gave the apostles witness of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus." In the resurrection the death of Jesus quickens into life; the victim becomes the victor; death itself dies. Jesus is risen indeed; and from that empty tomb goes forth throughout the Church on earth and in heaven, as with electric power, a new-born

life, quickening all whom it touches with immortality. Behold, then, thy grave, Christian warrior, radiant with the light of thy Saviour's wondrous resurrection! It is no longer cold, nor dark, nor lonely; Jesus has made it the sweet resting-place of them who sleep in him; it is the sacred urn in which the Lord Jesus has deposited the ransomed dust of the ruined temple of the spirit, there to repose beneath his watchful eye until the trump of the archangel shall bid it rise. "Now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept." My Christian brother, what comfort distills from this truth to the bereaved, who sorrow not as those who have no hope! The grave, it may be, has closed over all that gave to life its charm, and to your heart its bliss. If this should be your sad experience, let faith, and hope, and love, intwine in the garland you lay upon that cold breast; for this corruptible shall put on incorruption, and this mortal shall put on immortality. "Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?" "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ."

The graves of all his saints he blessed,
And softened every bed;
Where should the dying members rest,
But with their dying Head?

Thence he arose, ascending high,
And show'd our feet the way;
Up to the Lord our flesh shall fly,
At the great rising day.

Wonderful will Jesus appear in his second coming. Who can describe the wonders of that day, when the trump will sound, and the graves will open, and the sea give up its dead, and the heavens will be rolled up as a scroll, and the earth will melt with fervent heat, and earth's multiplied millions will stand around the judgment-seat? Christian friend, are you anticipating that event? are you prepared for its solemn issues? are you living with death, eternity, and judgment in full view? Fail not to make sure work for heaven by securing an interest in Jesus Christ. His name is "Wonderful," and wonderful is his grace and love to our fallen, ruined race. But how fearful must be the final condition of those who prefer sin and self, lusts and pleasures, the creature and the world, to this wonderful Being! The final indescribable and eternal sufferings of the lost will be in proportion to their rejection of this wonderful Saviour. Nothing can either keep you out or mitigate the torments of the world of ruin, if you die in your present persistent course of sin against God and your own soul. Hell is wonderful. It is, indeed, wonderful that it should exist; wonderful that it should be peopled by such countless souls; wonderful that its worm never dies, and that its fires are never to be extinguished; wonderful that it should be forever and ever. But the righteousness of God provides it, the justice of God demands it, and the immortality of God perpetuates it; and thus the appalling wonder involved in the existence, and intensity, and eternity of future punishment finds its true and solemn solution. My friend, traveler to the grave and to the bar of God,

risk not, I implore you, the precious, the undying well-being of your immortal, deathless soul. Think what it must be to be lost—forever lost. Be not deceived by the modern heresy that denies the eternity of future punishment, and be not misled by the equally false notion of the eternal unconsciousness of the soul. Both ideas are contradicted by the word of God, which, in a matter of such infinite moment to you, must be your sole guide. Go to Jesus, sit at his feet, learn of him, believe in him, embrace him, and you are saved. We become worldly as we have much to do with the world; we grow heavenly as we have much to do with heaven. Pause, then, and think that in one hour, yea, in one moment of time, you may leave all your wealth, and learning, and honors, and creature-loves, and find yourself a disembodied spirit, rushing through space, past suns and moons and stars, bound for heaven or hell—borne by angels to the world of brightness and delight, or dragged by demons to the world of suffering and darkness. How solemn and impressive the reflection! But if you believe in the wonderful Saviour, and have seen the wonders of his person, grace, and love—if you are trusting only in his blood for pardon and salvation, and are living and longing for his appearing—then soon the curtain will be drawn, and you shall see Jesus in all his unveiled wonder. Could we realize this fact more, how should we rise superior to present trial and sorrow, suffering and loss, and, soaring upon the wing of faith and hope, be more with Jesus our love—the Wonderful One! We should then pray for holiness, pant for holiness, and

strive for holiness, knowing that without holiness no man shall see the Lord. Dear friends, let us keep near by the cross, sheltered close by the Saviour's side, washing daily in his precious blood, constantly confessing him before the world—for the Lord living, and unto the Lord dying; and then heaven will be our eternal home!

THE METHOD OF DIVINE REVELATION.

BY THE REV. H. A. M. HENDERSON, D.D.

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son."—Heb. i. 1, 2.

THIS text marches like a stately procession, with God at the lead of its majestic column of truth. It distributes itself into the following parts: God has spoken to our race; he has spoken through the long and honored line of his prophets; he has spoken through the august ministry of his divine Son; he has spoken at chosen periods, and not by one all-inclusive revelation, given at the same moment of time; he has spoken to us by diversified methods and instrumentalities. Whatever God does he performs progressively. The world had its order of creations, and each day was magnificent with its own specific wonders. The Creator could have spoken the whole fabric of being into perfect existence by a single fiat, but it was not his elected method. If we accept the theory of the geologist and the chronology of the rocks, then myriads of our calendar years intervened the first and the last creative acts; if we interpret the Mosaic cosmogony literally, then six days were employed in organizing and furnishing the earth. The tree does not spring to maturity with

a single leap, but it *grows* by concentric layers of annual increase. The man is but the infant grown up—developed in body and mind, gradually. There is a "fullness of time for all things," and the clock of eternity alone can mark on its dial the period of God's ripened purposes. So the revelation of the divine will concerning man has been by successive stages of development. All the lessons of the law and prophets were elementary to the gospel, and the grand pictorial economy of the Levitical dispensation was a school-master's training to bring us to Christ. "Humanity, while under the law, is compared with a minor who requires education; with the coming in of Christ, it is considered grown up, mature, and independent." "The heir, as long as he is a child, is under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the father."

God *has* spoken—there is a majesty in the expression, as there is in the fact stated—not with the dumb lips of nature alone, but by oracular voices, intoned and instructed by the Spirit of infinite wisdom. He has elected to speak through human organs, or instrumentalities. Supreme wisdom is made apparent to human apprehension by the mode God adopted for revealing his mind. Miraculous disclosures, if constant, would soon cease to affect, and would be regarded as but common phenomena of nature. Sinai, perpetually thundering, and girt round with baldrie of lightning, would, in the course of ages, excite no more wonder and awe than does flaming Vesuvius. Spirits might appear to us, like that which passed before the face of Eliphaz, but the unsubstantial shade would soon

become familiar, and its voice be as unheeded as the sough of a winter's-night wind. Angels, bearing messages of duty, warning, or encouragement, might troop down from the sky, but the pinions upon which they descended would soon waft them back to their celestial home, and no permanent impression would remain after they had taken their airy flight. God spake by the holy men of old—moving them to utterance by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Such prophets left permanent records of the truths revealed to them, and thus gave to all future ages an enduring transcript of the divine mind and will. There must be a proper affinity between those who instruct and those who are instructed. This God has preserved in making *man* to speak to his fellows.

All truth needed not to be revealed at once. Providence worked out such results in human history as to require fresh disclosures to the mind and conscience of the race. Hence God has spoken, "at sundry times," by a succession of teachers. Truth is thus made corroborative, and the harmony of the teachings of patriarchs, prophets, Christ, and his apostles, must ever remain a most powerful argument for the divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. Enoch's recorded example, a life beyond the flood, is floated over the waters, and yet speaketh. Abraham, the patriarchal chief, spread far and wide the lesson of a high and holy faith, and his biography is trust, teaching by example. Moses gave the law, having received a granite edition from the hands of God. Then succeeded the prophets of Israel and Judah, in sublime order,

each breathed upon by the same Spirit, but far separate as to both time and place. They belonged to different generations, different ranks in society, and different occupations in daily life. Amos spoke from the herdsmen of Ephraim, and Daniel from the heathen court of proud Babylon, while David tuned his lyre to sublime strains as he sat on the throne of Israel; yet their words were immortal, and blended into a beautiful harmony, like so many different instruments in an orchestra, each playing a separate part, yet all combining in the production of one soul-stirring effect.

God permitted each of the prophets to preserve his own style. The matter constituted the essential revelation, while a diversified *manner* ministered to the soul's love of variety. God has not laid off the earth in rectangular patterns. We have diversity of mountain and plain, hill and dale, river and rivulet, ocean and lakelet, the green and flowery tapestry of the earth and the blue and star-fretted dome of the sky, the festooning of foliage and the dissolving cloud-work of the upper air. Man is a continent of varieties, and life is made up of the richness and variety of its experience. Though nature is diversified, there is unity in variety. The violet of the meadow and the cedar of Lebanon, the cascade and the cataract, the gem of the mine and the rocky battlements of the everlasting hills, all join in concert of scene and sound to proclaim one law and one God. God, in making a revelation to man, has adapted it to his love of variety. Hence we have the stately chapters of the Pentateuch, written in martial periods, as though Moses had made his pen

of his warrior-sword; we have the plaintive sobbings of Job's afflicted spirit—sentences which seem to cry; we have the rich, varied, tumultuous strains of David's harp; we have the gorgeous imagery of Isaiah, the plain matter-of-fact narrative of Matthew, the stern logic of Paul, the blunt, sententious periods of James, and the love-letter-like epistles of John, who had a double style—one that could breathe divinest accents of tenderness, and, if the theme befit, anon burst forth in tumults of magnificence, as in the book of Revelation. We find the word to have been spoken "in divers manners." Some proclaimed in simplest language the stern commandments of the Most High, while others reveled in all the tropical splendors of poetical fancy when they delineated his wondrous perfections. Some spoke the terse wisdom of proverbs, others inshrined their meaning in parables, and others in the mystic cloud of dreams and visions. Each preserved his own individuality, and caught his key from his circumstances, frame of mind, and the age in which he lived. But whatever the note struck, it had its place in the harmony of the whole; and the entire canon of the Scriptures clearly exhibit that one supreme Intelligence presided over every separate part, and unified all into one concert of principle and purpose. But God has also spoken by his Son: "To him give all the prophets witness." Jesus came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill. He came as the interpreter of prophecy. In him all the foregone testimony focalizes. He did not assume to amend, but to complete. When he died upon the cross, he cried, "It is fin-

ished." The future work of his inspired apostles was to preach his truth, and to furnish helpful commentaries upon it in their Epistles. No new truth was communicated after the ascension of Jesus, except that contained in the book of Revelation, and that is "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto John." The writings of the apostles were simply annotations upon the words of Jesus—amplifications of the lessons they had learned of him—applications of them to specific Churches and cases. The summary of what I have thus far set forth is this: that the Bible contains a graded course of instructions, diversified in its parts, yet with a perfect principle of harmony running through them—commencing with that which was adapted to the infancy, and ending in that which accords with and fills the utmost maturity, of the human mind—bearing within themselves a divine method and purpose, a recognition of man's constitution, and operating upon society with a combined and cumulative influence.

As, from the summit of our own age, I meditate the power of these sacred writings upon human thought, I am thoroughly convinced that they contain the didactic text by which the race has been, and is to be, trained in every thing that pertains to spiritual education. This idea is implied in the text. Paul declares that the *law*, which he employs as a generic term to represent the whole religious economy of the Jewish people, was a school-master to bring men to Christ—*i. e.*, to introduce them to the tuition of the Great Teacher, and the domination of his doctrines. And is not Christ the Master Teacher,

giving the seal of authority to all the prophets, and dictating the ethics and hopes of mankind to the end of time? The view we have before us is intended to excite a befitting reverence for the sacred Scriptures. It seems to your preacher to furnish an efficient means for silencing the most plausible cavils which have been suggested to destroy their credibility. Is it asserted that the representations are sometimes coarse and imperfect? Then, we reply, They were intended for the education of rude generations totally unfitted to receive the refinements of a more abstract and spiritual culture. The early training of mankind was necessarily rudimentary. Looking, then, upon the Scriptures as intended by God to train the race, I present for your consideration the length of time which they include in their lasting chronicles. They are older than any other compositions. They commence with the dim dawn of human culture, and are contemporaneous with the very birth of the alphabet. They contain the history of the race in its early childhood. They delineate the events of that primitive period with a stately simplicity. They recite the faith and practices of the pastoral patriarchs. They chronicle the life of Moses, the representative of the Hebrew law and state. Under the code which he gave, as the agent of Jehovah, was inaugurated the economy of that singular people, which, though composed of neither statesmen nor scholars, warriors nor merchants, and confined and devoted to a little area of mountainous country, from which they never journeyed except as dejected captives, have yet left monuments of themselves more lasting and impos-

ing than those bequeathed posterity by classic nations, and impressed themselves, like sculptured lettering in marble, on the religious thought of every enlightened people upon the globe. Even the minor chapters of their national history, though preponderating largely in sad records of their perverseness, are full of absorbing and educative interest, to the degree, at least, of suggesting that they are the very chronicles of Providence itself, disclosing almost to view that sovereign power which sets up one and pulls down another throne, and which we are too prone to retire from credence behind the screen of secondary causes.

After Moses and his mission, the splendid procession of the prophets march across the stage, introducing, with an imposing pomp, the Son of God, who was to pronounce the baccalaureate of the world's graduation in the doctrines of duty and destiny. Does not this aligned spectacle of divine revelation, exhibited through such a protracted breadth of time—beginning with the race in the infant-school, and graduating it in the loftiest course of spiritual truth—afford some hint that the purpose of God, from the beginning, was the education of mankind up to a full apprehension of God as an ever-present Spirit, an all-wise and benignant Lawgiver, an infinite Governor, yet universal Father, and out of these precious doctrines to establish in the race respect for authority, submission to righteous rule and the exalted sentiments of filial love and fear? The bondage in Egypt, of the Israelites, by producing a common suffering, originated a federated sympathy, schooled them in lessons of

brotherhood, and allied them in bonds of union, stronger than any other people ever possessed. So, if we wish to find the initial point of that training which, when completed, resulted in the most compact nationality the world ever witnessed—a nationality of feeling which survives to this day among the Jews, wherever scattered—we must seek for it in the brick-yards of the Pharaohs, and under the lash of Egyptian task-masters. The intention of the miracles performed by Moses in Egypt was to give his people some object-lessons which would lead them to the recognition of Jehovah as the true and living God, and enable them to discover the superiority to the divinities of the gross idolatry by which they were surrounded. The first miracle destroyed the serpents, and the second and third were directed against the Nile. The serpents and the river were objects of Egyptian worship. By destroying the first, and turning the second into sources of putrescence and plague, he demonstrated the impotency of their alleged divinities and sacred things and places. The intention of the remaining miracles is equally apparent. Suffice it that God, by miraculous agency, directed against the idolatry of Egypt, established in the minds of his chosen people the conviction of his omnipotent supremacy and his ability to execute his judgments upon the earth. By this object-training, the heresy of a plurality of gods was removed from their minds, and the ancient reverence for the God of Abraham revived in its pure and primitive power. They had now learned alpha in the alphabet of their education. The next lesson was to teach them the unde-

rived and self-existent nature of Jehovah. The name by which he directed Moses to make him known was "I AM THAT I AM." In the original, the simple form of the verb is employed, agreeing, in the construction of the Hebrew language, with the first person present, indicative of the verb *to be* in our own language. Thus, you see, the single idea was the personality of a self-existent being—a lesson short, yet possessed of a comprehension in the development of pure religion which was all-embracing—a circumference of such an extent that all the smaller circles of truth may be drawn and included in it.

God becomes the Benefactor of his elected people. He visits his judgments upon their oppressors, breaks the yoke of their bondage, and relieves them from the cruelty of their task-masters. A thing being done for them in the nature of a deliverance from their galling slavery, their affections are reached, gratitude is evoked, and a sense of obligation is imposed. After the exodus from Egypt, God proceeded to give the Israelites a code of moral laws, simple in their requirements, yet broad in their application, accompanying the revelation by such dramatic and spectacular effects as would impress them with the majesty of the Lawgiver. Thus far they had been taught lessons of wisdom, power, and goodness; and now the Levitical economy was introduced, with its multiform provisions for purity, that through the senses they might be taught the doctrine of divine holiness. Every thing was purified. Things were divided into two classes—the clean and the unclean. All their domestic and re-

ligious life was associated with objects that would remind them of the necessity for purity. The very ablutions they daily performed, and the food upon which they subsisted, no less than the tabernacle service, by the law of the association of ideas with things, were intended to throne in their minds conceptions of holiness. The whole Levitical dispensation was symbolical, and when the thing signified had been thoroughly established was to pass away. Like the rudiments and simple stories of the boy, to be laid aside when he had attained his manhood, so were these ceremonies and ordinances, "patterns of things in the heavens," to be removed when the race had been gotten ready for the higher tuitions of the Great Teacher, Jesus Christ. The ideas of justice and mercy, the exceeding sinfulness of sin, the need of an atonement, were taught by the sin and trespass offerings. All these sacrifices were prefatory to the offering of "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." Thus God's primer was pictorial, and prepared the way for the introduction of his higher truth.

After the Jewish state and religion had become permanently established, we mark a transitional period, in which the prophets, building upon the foundations already securely laid, set forth their lessons, and uttered their predictions, by a more spiritual method. The Church of the future rises on the horizon of vision, and its true characteristics and triumphs are ecstatically described. The gospel day breaks gradually; the stars that gemmed the early night fade away; the galaxies that held festival in the sky of revelation at a later hour begin to

pale; faint lines of light streak the east; the morning transfiguration begins to glow, and the Sun of righteousness rises to the view with healing in his wings of light and love. That Sun is climbing to the zenith, and when the meridian splendor shines, it will warm the universal heart of mankind until it bursts into the flowery glory of paradise restored—the millennial era of a triumphant Church. Thank God, we dwell in the refulgent day, and have reached the apex of divine training!

Just prior to the advent of Jesus, Providence arranged for the dispersion of his trained people. They, in turn, were to be school-masters of the nations of the earth. They were scattered wide through the Roman Empire, then almost cosmopolitan in extent, made so by the triumphs of Julius Cesar's arms; and in every land they traversed they spread the knowledge of the one living, true, and holy God. The temple-worship, still retained at Jerusalem, unified their faith, and kept its ardor alive. Thither the tribes went annually to offer their sacrifices. The apostles were commanded to "begin at Jerusalem" the preaching of the gospel. *There* were a people made ready for the higher training. After a sufficient number of representative minds had been inoculated with the doctrines of Christ, the temple was finally destroyed, the state religion of the Jews was abolished at its capital, and fierce and unremitting persecution drove them far abroad to spread the contagion of the new faith which they had received. The day of Pentecost, in multiplying converts from all nations, increased the centers of influence, and "Parthians,

and Medes, and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia, Phrygia, and Pamphylia, in Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes," went forth from this baptism of the Holy Ghost—this unifying of the nationalities in the common kingdom of Jesus Christ—to spread afar, among their respective countrymen, the story of the cross.

Thus we are enabled to see how one part of God's plan is correlated to another, how a unity of purpose is discerned amid a multiplicity of details, and how Providence surely and steadily affords the conditions that assure a progressive improvement, and secure his entire system of spiritual training from the possibility of final failure.

It is well to be reminded, at this point, that the same Providence which has so successfully conducted the past is now at work, and will secure the triumphs of an expectant present and an approaching future. The symbolic vision of Ezekiel is almost open to the natural eye. Faith can see the whirring of the wheels of Providence, and hear their busy hum. Every revolution is spinning out some new thread that shall enter into the shining web of the bride's wedding-garment. The hand of Omnipotence turns the axle of the great power-wheel which moves every cog in the vast machinery of the world's progress.

Consider that all I have described as preparatory to the advent of Christ, and as affording the best conditions for the spread of religious truth, before and after the ascension, was measurably the work

of a single people, noted for nothing else but a holy preëminence over surrounding nations—a people that have risen up in so wide a stretch of time to make brotherhood with the greatest of the earth, and then have their scepter of power shattered forever. As a single nation, in its sacred traditions, extends itself from the first period of recorded time till all oracles are hushed into abashed silence by the voice of God's beloved Son, the Teacher of mankind, Israel's current chronicles are the records of Jehovah's providential dealings with his offspring. Her ordinary literature is composed of prophecy and psalm. Her very legends are inshrined by the sanctity of ages, and arrest and retain the reverent attention of mankind. There is in these patent facts convincing proof that points out her office among the families of the world. If, with the eye of the reviewer, we scan the past history of the race, we find that those pompous communities that were contemporaneous with her, and which were in every regard, except in this single respect, far superior to her in the elements of national grandeur and renown, have gone down to the charnel-house of time without leaving a tithe of her power in the world. Where are the swarthy masons who built the Pyramids? Where are the skillful sculptors that fashioned the stony features of the Sphinx, whose searching eyes steadily gaze over the wastes of the Lybian desert, and sweep the boundless horizon of the overspread skies as if seeking to solve the enigmas of time and to read the riddles of eternity? What have they left behind but the massive puzzles of the desert?

Where are those who whitened the air of the Mediterranean with the sails of their commerce, or reddened its waters with the blood of their naval battles? Tell us of those whose burnished and conquering eagles were carried to remotest boundaries, and who boasted in a proud supremacy over a thousand subjugated and dependent provinces? Tyre, the wise, the purple merchant of the Orient, now a bleak rock by the sea-shore, on which a few paltry fishermen spread their rude nets, has bequeathed us as little of her wisdom as she has vestiges of her ancient prosperity. Babylon, the boast of early civilization, remains to us in a heap of rubbish, spread over a morass—ruins which only excite the curiosity of antiquarians, who strive to decipher the barbarous characters upon the rude tiles of which her fabled magnificence was built. Egypt herself, the acknowledged cradle and capital of ancient arts and civilization, grand in her ruined estate, affords nothing but barren names and titles, and dubious dates, sculptured on her colossal monuments that yet brave the onsets of time. But that small remnant of a widely-scattered people retains a religious life of its own, and a peculiar and perpetual influence in the works of its gifted children. Was not this our Saviour's meaning when he said, "Salvation is of the Jews?" It is said that Abraham saw Christ's day, and was glad in the spiritual prospect which it afforded. Now, when we reflect on the wide space of time through which the links are extended, from the "Father of the faithful" to the Son of God, is it not apparent that this despised portion of the race was singled

out by Providence for the religious training of the rest?

Suppose it can be shown that the Old Testament is defective—we would, in such a case, maintain that this was its distinction, rather than its reproach. The cavil that it leaves untouched the most absorbing topics of contemplation is thus discerned to reinforce the best claims which it holds on the admiration and gratitude of mankind. Its imperfections are prophetic: for it was awaiting a fulfillment in later disclosures of the mind and heart of God. The gospel is the fulfilling of the law and the prophets; the gospel is the blossoming of the truth. Decide now whether all this course of means, this system of preparations, has been wasted, or whether it has not, on the contrary, moved mightily upon society in the accomplishment of that whereunto it was appointed. It has not achieved all its mission; the leaven is still at work, and larger blessings are to be born of its workings. But this is in perfect analogy with the plan of education—to grow by a gradual process, and produce its best fruits last. It has rooted in the common faith of humanity those twin doctrines of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men, and thus assured the race against both idolatry and despair.

There are hidden truths in the Bible yet to be brought to light. No astronomer can doubt that, with the increase of instrumental power, new constellations will blaze out upon the field of vision, more powerful lenses will pierce into profounder depths of space, and new worlds will be pictured on the spectrum of the telescope. So with an ad-

vancing intelligence, and the farther spreading of Christianity among different races of men now enveloped in pagan darkness: we doubt not a deeper insight will be obtained of the spiritual meaning of God's truth, which will have the effect to enlarge the conceptions, strengthen the faith, and encourage the hopes, of humanity. Were it possible to admit so irreverent a hypothesis as that this blessed Book should one day be made to seem no more than the elementary lessons by which the infancy of the soul was to be trained—in such a case, it could be demonstrated that it has proven of inestimable worth. But it far transcends this: it infolds within itself the mainspring of eternal progress. Each text of the Bible is a casket of soul-jewels. Once, while on a mountain in Indiana, I picked up a rough bowlder. There was nothing pleasing in its rugged, nodular appearance; but, being a singular formation, it excited my curiosty. I picked up another stone, and broke it in twain. I found that it was a hollow sphere, containing the most brilliant quartz-crystals—some of them sparkling like unclouded diamonds, and others purple, wearing the subdued semblance of the amethyst. And so it has been to the minds of many in the study of the Bible: some passages hitherto unnoticed, or passed over as homely and unattractive, have been placed under the hammer of thought, and, when its inner heart was laid open, been found to be radiant with spiritual jewelry. Hence the significance of the injunction, "*Search* the Scriptures." A mere superficial reader may see no beauty and little value in them; but he who delves deep is digging in a mine

of exhaustless treasures, and will be rewarded with truths and comforts more precious than rubies—decorations for the insignia befitting the court-costume of a nobleman of God—jewels for that golden crown which zones the brows of the celestial kings. In this latter day, from the cloud of mystery and doubt, there comes to our ears an assuring voice, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him."

ANGELIC SYMPATHY.

BY THE REV G. B. POAGE.

"Likewise, I say unto you, There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth."—Luke xv. 10.

ANGELS are beings of superior intelligence and dignity to man in the highest scale of existence. As to their nature and affinities, the Scriptures furnish us with no detailed or satisfactory information upon the subject. If they are corporeal beings, as their mode of manifestation to the patriarchs and prophets would indicate, the texture of their material frames is of a more ethereal and sublimated consistence than that which we usually imagine essential to the idea of corporeality; and although these celestial inhabitants might be, in their normal state, invisible to the dull and obtuse vision of mortals, it would be by no means positive, or even probable, evidence that they are wholly devoid of material frames. The atmosphere we breathe, we know, is a material substance, and yet it is invisible; and there are other material bodies, with which the chemist is familiar, absolutely ten times lighter and farther removed from the range of our gross and imperfect visual organs than common atmospheric air. Thousands of animalcules, too infinitesimal to be perceived by the naked eye, are,

nevertheless, beings of the most perfect, though delicate and complex, material organizations. In every instance, on all occasions where angels have come on embassies to man, they have displayed frames and developed proportions, emitted sounds, uttered sublime sentiments, discoursed the sweetest music—all of which were cognizable to the natural senses of those to whom they bore their messages. In all these scriptural delineations of angelic intercourse with our race, we perceive nothing to militate against the idea of their being identified with the material as well as the spiritual universe, and possessing highly-refined material frames suited to their nature and high employments. The materials for a history of this race of celestial beings, at our command, are extremely scanty; nor is it a matter of wonder, since the Bible does not claim to be the chronicle of events, or races, other than those expressly appertaining to our earth. That the vast worlds which the telescope has brought to view, and which roll such a splendor over the high attributes of Jehovah, are wild, unpeopled solitudes, is an idea at variance with reason and the perfections of the Deity; but the character, relations, and destiny of the race which they accommodate, and the events of which they are the theater, we neither know nor have we any means of knowing. The Bible is a treatise, or history, of the race with which God has peopled our planet; and whatever correlative or *trans-terrene* allusions, either of a cosmical or other character, fringe with sublimity the connective thread of the history, they are merely incidental, and for the most part we are left to conjecture, from

the beauty of these allusions, what splendid discoveries are yet to be made. The field of knowledge traversed by human capacity, over which even an inspired history has spread its radiance, is, in the nature of things, comparatively circumscribed; yet it is amply spacious and sufficiently wide to exhaust all our powers of research—to tax all our credulity in mastering its difficulties, solving its problems, and correcting its truths. At what period, and under what circumstances, angels were created, we are not informed; some ancient chronicler of the skies could tell us. It is traced on some page of celestial history; it dwells among the sacred traditions; lingers among the cherished memorials of years, or eras, dating far anterior to the creation. Whatever may have been their employments, and the theater of their benevolent operations anterior to this epoch, we are informed they were the anxious and enthrilled spectators of three of the most stupendous events that ever took place on this earth. For ages they may have been made, as now, by the Almighty his swift-winged messengers of mercy or intelligence to the denizens of the other worlds. We know, however, that a *trio* of grand and sublime achievements enlisted their warmest concern—viz.: the creation, the redemption of our race, and the "repentance of one sinner." Angels were present when Omnipotence laid the foundation of this earth, when he molded it into form, beauty, and harmony, gave the sun its bounds, and garnished the heavens with glory. They were pleased with this display of divine power and beneficence, and "sang together for joy." On burning wing, from

empyrean heights, they saw man come forth, "made but a little lower than" themselves, and "crowned with glory and honor;" they flew to this new orb God had added to the family of worlds, and, gathering around this the first of a new order of things about to be introduced upon the theater of the universe, they hailed him welcome to their society; they kissed his bright unsullied brow, and leaving him to regale himself in the flowers of Eden, and beautiful earth and sky, hasted away to relate the wonders they had seen to kindred spirits in other worlds. Alas! when man reached forth his hand and partook of the forbidden fruit, and involved himself in sin and guilt, angels fled in consternation from his presence, and bewailed the sad and melancholy fate that had befallen him. The God-gifted being around whose form they had wound ties of *tenderness* and sympathy, and deemed worthy of their society, was turned out of paradise to inhabit the cold, blasted, and accursed world. The abode which before they delighted to visit is now too unholy and desolate to be pressed with their feet or cheered with their song. But no sooner does the compassion of God pour forth itself in the splendors of a glorious promise of restoration and recovery to the angel-abandoned and guilty pair than these celestial beings, ever interested in the works of divine goodness, resumed their visits, though in a more retiring manner. Their residence and their employments, it is true, are about the celestial throne of God; but, poised on waiting wing, they are ever ready to obey his behests, "hearkening to the voice of his word." Mysterious and compli-

cated is the scheme of divine providence. That angels form a part of, and take an active interest in, the administration of the divine government and the evolution of human affairs, no one who reads the Old or the New Testament can deny. If the angels of God do not sympathize with our planet, and mingle in the affairs of this world, then the Bible is a book whose language is too ambiguous to be understood, or too treacherous to be believed. The modern spiritual manifestations we utterly repudiate; but, at the same time, no abuse or perversion, however gross or blasphemous, which wicked and deluded men may make of a plain scriptural truth shall ever deter us from defending it; and the best antidote to such perversions of the truths of the Bible, as this modern theory of spiritualism certainly is, is an exposition of the plain truth as the word of God unfolds it. Opposite extremes meet. A denial of all angelic ministrations ends precisely where this ultra driveling and insane sophism of a modern date ends—in infidelity. The history of the patriarchs and prophets furnishes us with many thrilling and consoling instances of angelic visitations. The doctrine is, indeed, interwoven throughout the entire texture of God's word.

When Abraham, the "father of the faithful," was called upon to discharge a most mysterious and trying duty—the sacrifice of his son Isaac—a bright angel arrested his uplifted arm, and announced to him the divine acknowledgment of his faith, and the glorious promise that "in his seed should all nations be blessed." When the cities of the plain had filled up the cup of their iniqnity, and God de-

termined to overthrow them in his wrath, bright spirits hasted to rescue righteous Lot from the overwhelming scourge. While the good man, guided by angels, abandoned the cities of the plain to destruction, those splendid and stately specimens of wealth and art were devoured by the rage of a fierce and resistless conflagration, and the beautiful and verdant landscape that sparkled in the rays of the morning sun, ere that fatal day closed, presented nought but a heap of smoldering ruins. When Jacob left his father's house, a solitary wanderer, fleeing from the face of his enraged brother, and wearied with the journey of the day, he resigned himself to rest—the earth for his bed, a stone for his pillow, and the broad, blue canopy above for a covering; a ladder, reaching from heaven to earth, appeared to him in a dream, strung with bright-winged angels, descending to earth and ascending again to heaven. When Jacob opened his eyes, he exclaimed, "Surely the Lord is in this place; and I knew it not." At a subsequent period of his eventful history, when sorrow had clouded his heart and saddened his spirits, one of the same company of these celestial spirits met him at Peniel, with whom he wrestled, and with whose blessing he passed on to meet his incensed brother. They met in peace. Who can tell what influence angels exerted in bringing about this happy result? Often, while treading in the path of Abraham's faith, crushed with sore bereavements, and borne down with manifold sorrows, how sweet and consoling to his aching heart must have been the reflection that he was attended by unseen angel-friends! When the

Prophet Elijah was pursued by the cruel and impious Jezebel, he fled solitary and alone into the wilderness, in the deep and silent solitudes of which he laid himself down, weary and exhausted. So utterly hopeless was his condition, that "he requested for himself that he might die." Having fallen asleep, a bright, beautiful spirit gently touched him, and, in words of sweetness and love, said, "Arise, and eat." There was already prepared a homely, though refreshing, repast for the weary and persecuted servant of God. When Elijah, followed by Elisha, had passed over Jordan, and the latter had requested that a double portion of the prophet's spirit should come upon him, while they were going on, conversing familiarly together, "behold, there appeared a chariot of fire, and horses of fire, and they parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven." There is no positive mention of angels in the narrative, but they were doubtless present, whether visible or not, and followed in the train of the prophet, as he sublimely swept upward to the skies in that fiery chariot.

At a subsequent period in Elisha's history, the Syrian king encompassed the city of Dothan, in which he dwelt, with a mighty host. Escape seemed impossible. His servant exclaimed, "Alas, my master! how shall we do?" Every avenue of escape seemed to be cut off; but, with marvelous intrepidity, he answered, "Fear not: for they that be with us are more than they that be with them." And when the eyes of the servant were opened, he beheld "the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha." The Syrian

host were as chaff before the armies of the skies; the mountain, from base to battlement, was glittering in the morning sun with chariots of flame. Such are some of the instances of angelic visitations in the history of the patriarchs.

We now come to the second grand event over which angels held a festivity—viz.: the redemption of man. On this stupenduous occasion, angelic sympathy rose to its highest intensity. On the morning of the Saviour's birth, there was deep commotion and wondering delight among the heavenly hosts. Never were heaven and earth, since the fall, drawn so near together. Angels had shouted over the world as it arose from chaos and took its place in the planetary system; they witnessed with pleasure the creation of man, and honored and caressed him as a brother-member of the great family of Heaven; they were his attendants through years and generations of trials and vicissitudes; and now, when in the fullness of time his redemption draweth nigh, they are the first on golden wing to "fly with eager joy to bear the news to man." On that glorious morning, the heavens were resplendent with their flashing plumage and vocal with their triumphant acclamation. Then it was that a note of vocal melody was struck on earth that rolled up to heaven, and still is swelling in deep-toned symphonies among the sublimest doxologies of the skies. Bright spirits attended the suffering Saviour from the manger to the cross. Tempted by the devil in the wilderness, they were with him in that fearful conflict; and when the evil spirit left him, "they came and min-

istered unto him." When he endured the heart-rending agony of the garden, and the shadows of his approaching doom were gathering about his trembling spirit, one of those bright spirits wound his gentle arms around the Sufferer, and strengthened him for the final conflict. When the awful scenes of Calvary were enacted, and terror seemed to convulse all nature; when the cries of the expiring Saviour were unheeded in heaven and mocked in hell; when his groans were answered by the shock of the earthquake and the bursting of the tombs—legions of angels rallied around him, till, bidden by the command of God, they fled in consternation from the scene. When priest and soldier laughed with malicious mockery at the agonies which convulsed the shivering frame of Jesus, an army of seventy thousand angels shook the heavens with the thunder of their plumage, as on flashing, fiery wing they were ready to rush to the rescue of their dying Lord. They were present at the tomb on the morning of the resurrection; rolling away the stone, they poured a tide of splendor into the grave brighter than that of ten thousand suns, and spread the news abroad of this the grandest achievement that had ever graced the glorious campaign of the mighty Conqueror of earth and hell. When he ascended Mount Olivet, to take leave of earth, these glorious spirits were there; they heard his benediction of love to his disciples; saw him as he embraced them, perhaps, one by one, and, mounting his cloudy chariot, swept up to his heavenly home. The glorious shouts that greet him on his arrival at the gates of

the Eternal City we almost hear, laden with the spoils and crowned with the honors of a campaign of suffering and of victory: "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in." While the host that are within inquire, "Who is this King of glory?" the grand procession that form the pageant of his upward and triumphant march shout, "The Lord strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle." "The Lord of hosts, he is the King of glory." "Lift up your heads, O ye gates; and be ye lifted up, ye everlasting doors; and the King of glory shall come in."

Thus we have seen, in the patriarchal times—in the childhood of our race—angels treading with men the sorrowing paths of earth. We have seen them increasing in the frequency of their visits and splendor of their array, as the gleam of their glorious plumage spread over the glowing sky that canopied the birth-spot of the Saviour; we have almost heard the peal of the thunder-shout that greeted the victorious Captain of our salvation, on his arrival at the portal of the skies. And is this the last of angelic ministrations on earth? is our world entirely shut out from their sympathies? We know it is an exile, a wandering orb, from the loyal family of worlds; but is it farther from heaven, the abode of angels, *now* than when in its infancy? Is the path they once trod less beaten, or the avenues along which they once glided to earth all closed up? Has the ladder of the patriarch's dream been taken down, and the last bridge, like a rainbow spanning the intervening gulf, been re-

moved forever? No, no. There are events still taking place on earth in which they are deeply interested. The tide of redemption is rolling on, the scheme of a world's conquest is now in active and glorious operation. They mark with wonder and admiration each new discovery of wisdom, every fresh evolution of mercy, in the grand progressive march of the gospel. They bend forward from their high abodes, and "desire to look into" the wonders of redemption. So intensely interested are they in the practical results of the gospel that even the conversion of *one sinner* is an occasion of joy among their shining ranks. This is an event of no ordinary moment. The creation of the material universe is an achievement not to rival it, and the redemption of our race alone surpasses it in moral significance and grandeur.

Earth is still honored with angelic sympathy—the walks of life still haunted with bright spirits, who form a connecting-link of social and spiritual commerce with the world above. We are aware that a different opinion prevails among some. It is supposed that our earth stands at a cold distance from that clime gladdened by the song and smile of saints and angels. By what scriptural or rational argument this notion is maintained we cannot conceive. The sentiment of the poet, that "angels' visits are few and far between," has passed into a proverb. The pulpit canonizes it, and many an eloquent sermon is gemmed with this poetical error. It may be beautiful poetry, but its theology is as frigid as an iceberg. But to maintain it, let us see what sad havoc is to be made of God's word and the plainest

deductions of reason. The doctrine is not denied, so far as patriarchal, and even apostolical, times are concerned. But there is no necessity now, it is said, for any such angel interpositions; this element of the divine economy has been supplied. As to any such necessity we are not to be the judges; but what becomes of all those promises made to David and others in the Old Testament and the New—such as, "I will give my angels charge concerning thee," etc.? If they are applied merely to those times, so is every other promise in God's word of a general import. That they were given for a temporal or specific purpose, not one syllable of proof can be adduced. In this rationalistic age, it is objected that we do not see their gleaming wings, feel their soft hands, or hear their sweet voices; and therefore angels tread not, with man, sorrowing paths below. Unfortunately the argument proves too much, and therefore proves nothing. All orthodox Christians hold the personality of the devil: he is a fallen angel. That he "goes about as a roaring lion," and while hell is his proper abode, he nevertheless visits our earth, touches with an infidel wand the hearts of men, seducing them to evil, etc. —"*all this you steadfastly believe*," and yet you have never seen his lowering brow, or heard the rustle of his darkling wing, or felt the damning touch of his pollution. I ask, if a fallen angel, or thunder-blasted spirit, can come and mingle among us on earth, impress our hearts with evil, how is it so unreasonable to suppose that a good angel can also visit our planet, cold and blighted as it is, touch our hearts with his celestial influence, incite us to virtue, and

wing us upward to heaven? What strange but pious impulses sometimes break the monotony of our earthly pillow? Is it unreasonable to believe that a good angel swept over our hearts, at such times, and turned them to holy emotions? The vast, interminable fields of nature are before them—from worlds to distant worlds afar they take their flight; but wherever they sweep, on whatever mission they go, they always stop to drop comfort and whisper consolation in the hearts of the weeping penitent. New tides of joy and new songs of rapture roll and swell around the seraph-encircled throne above over "one sinner that repenteth." The generations in which we live are moving in solemn procession to the spirit-world; among them are our dearest friends, some of whom almost daily fade from our gaze to become the angels of God. We follow them to the borders of the other world; we ask, Are they indeed eternally separated from us? We may "know they are happy with their angel plumage on;" but this does not satisfy us. Do they love us still? sympathize with us still? Does the light of their influence fall upon our hearts, and cheer us here below? But go with me to the chamber "where the good man meets his fate." How soft and gentle are the footsteps of angels there! how sweet the music they sometimes make to dying ones! Who were with Elijah when in a whirlwind he swept upward to heaven? Angels. Who was with the Saviour, in the garden, on the cross, at the tomb, on the Mount of Ascension? Who bore the spirit of Lazarus and enthroned him in Abraham's bosom? Who, O *who*, "when the reaping-time shall come," "will shout

the harvest-home?" Angels. No wonder the rustlings of their wings are heard, and the music of their sweet songs greet the ears of the dying saints of God. No wonder while the vision of the departing spirit is becoming dull to earth, it should become more keen with reference to eternal realities. No wonder, like old Bishop George, he spreads his arms abroad and shouts, "They are come, they are come!" It is no phantom of a reeling brain; it is the light of heaven shining through the veil of humanity, unsealing the spiritual senses to see the "chariots of Israel and the horsemen thereof," waiting at the bed of death. See the wheels in motion! The bells are ringing in paradise, and angels rejoicing, as onward and upward they cleave the sky, and chariot and horseman, passenger and host, are lost in the all-ingulfing glory of eternal day! Amen.

THE AGREEMENT OF THE MOSAIC AND SCIENTIFIC COSMOGONIES.

BY THE REV J C. MORRIS, A.M.

BY eosmogony is meant the doctrine, or seience, of the creation of the world. The Mosaic eosmogony is that given to us in Genesis; the scientifie eosmogony is that eonstrueted upon the facts and prineiples of seienee as discovered independently of the Bible. Our purpose is to show that these two systems are essentially in agreement.

There are two classes of persons who deny this position. One says that the Bible is not true, beeause it eontradicts scientific facts and deductions; the other says that science is not true, because it eontradiets the Bible. But, so far as this issue is eoneerned, they are both wrong. The first, if they understand what science teaehes, do not understand what the Bible doetrine is; while the other, if they understand what the Bible doctrine is, do not know what science says. The two records *must* agree; they are both written by the same hand, and that the hand of God, who is "yesterday, to-day, and forever the same," "with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." When rightly understood, the Bible and seience must speak the same truth. To be sure, while our knowledge of either is imperfect, we eannot expect to see a perfeetion of

agreement; yet, with even an imperfect acquaintance with both, we can see such a general agreement as ought to make us satisfied that what seems to be conflict is owing to our ignorance.

In order to get the subject fairly presented, it will be necessary to take each record—the Mosaic and the scientific—separately, showing precisely what it is, and then compare them, that we may see how they agree with each other.

The Bible account begins: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep." (Gen. i. 1, 2.) These words may refer to the original work of creation out of nothing, and what follows to the work of orderly arrangement and preparation of this mass as a dwelling-place for man and beast. The clause seems to point to a work which the writer only wished to mention in most general terms, hastening on to the six days' work, which he wished to describe particularly.

"The earth was without form and void." A quotation from eminent Jewish writers will suffice to show what these words mean. R. Kimchi says: "*Tohu* and *bohu* (translated "without form and void") signify waste and emptiness; and the wise ones say *tohu* is a thing which is without form and likeness, yet so adapted that it may receive any form and likeness whatever." (Quoted in Crit. Sac. ix. 2,843.) The phrase simply means that all things were created in crude material. God had merely brought into existence the *principia* out of which the present order of things was developed, or arranged.

The record of the work of the six days really begins with the next clause—"The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters"—which seems intended to mark a new beginning. The word rendered "moved upon" literally signifies *to brood over*, and is used of birds sitting on their eggs. It here expresses the idea that the Spirit of God brooded over and vivified the mass, imparting to its molecules life and energy.

"And God said, Let there be light; and there was light." This passage needs no explanation just here.

"And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament." "And God called the firmament Heaven." This word "firmament" evidently marks the atmosphere. The office assigned to it here clearly points to this: it is to divide between the waters above—the clouds, and the waters beneath—on the face of the earth, to keep them from commingling. So the firmament is not the expanse, or, as we say, "the vault of heaven," but the atmosphere.

It is no objection to this that the stars are said to be "set in the firmament." This is merely a popular expression—a phenomenal description. This meaning of the word "firmament" appears from the expression in verse 20, "Fowl that may *fly in the open firmament*," clearly pointing to the atmosphere.

"Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land ap-

pear." We understand from this passage that the whole face of the earth in this first state was entirely covered by the sea; there was no dry land at all. This appears from the passage, "Thou coveredst it (the earth) with the deep as with a garment." (Ps. civ. 6.)

"And God said, Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed was in itself, upon the earth." This needs no explanation; it simply designates the beginning of plant-life in general. The order in which the record presents the different species of plants is worthy of remark here. We have first "grass," which word, in the original, does not mean simply the green grassy sod, but rather the tender and most delicate plants, such as lichens, ferns, and mosses. We have next "the herb yielding seed," which in Hebrew is used of shrubs and vegetables. Last, we have "the fruit tree yielding fruit, whose seed is in itself," which evidently means the larger vegetables, fruit-bearing trees.

"And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and for years." Here we have the first mention of the heavenly bodies as such; but we are not to suppose that it is intended to note their first creation. They are a part of the *heaven* spoken of in the first verse, and were created at the same time the earth was created. Some object that in the record of the fourth day's work it is said, "God *made* two great lights," referring to the sun and the moon. The word here rendered *made* is commonly used in Scripture, meaning *to appoint, to constitute*,

to make ready. In Genesis xviii. 7 it is used of the process of preparing a calf to be eaten. So here it simply means that God appointed, or set apart, these two great lights for this special service.

The answer to the objections that the light of the sun did not appear until the fourth day we postpone to a subsequent part of this discourse.

"And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life, and fowl that may fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly," etc. This evidently refers to the creation of (1) water animals, for the language is, "Let the *waters* bring forth;" and (2) of fowls and birds. When we read "great whales" here, we are not to understand the great mammals of that name. The Hebrew word simply means "great monsters."

"And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind." "And God made the beast of the earth after his kind, and cattle after their kind, and every thing that creepeth upon the earth after his kind." Here we have the creation of land animals: "Let the *earth* bring forth;" "that creepeth *upon the earth.*"

"And God said, Let us make man . . . So God created man in his own image." This is the crowning work. Human beings are the closing act of the creative drama.

Now, to sum up all in a few words, we have this order: 1. The original creation out of nothing; 2.

The creation of light; 3. The appointment of the firmament, or atmosphere; 4. (*a*) The separation of the land and water, and (*b*) the creation of plant-life; 5. The appearance of the sun and the moon; 6. The creation of creeping things, fowls, and great monsters (marine animals); 7. (*a*) Land animals, and (*b*) man. This is the Bible record—the Mosaic cosmogony.

We have now to ascertain the order presented to us in the scientific cosmogony.

1. Going back to the farthest point reached in speculative science, we find two theories in reference to the primordial condition of the earth. The first of these is known as the "nebular hypothesis," first systematized by La Place, afterward accepted by Comte, and vigorously defended by the anonymous author of "Vestiges of Creation." According to this theory, all the heavenly bodies were developed out of a universal "fire-mist," which was by some power put into motion, and from which, by centrifugal force, fragments were thrown off, and in time condensed into planets. In other words, the theory takes us back to a beginning of the earth-life, when the earth was nothing but a rolling mass of fire-mist —when even its outlines were not marked. The other theory, which has been held by a majority of the most eminent scientists of Europe and America, is this: that the original condition of the world was a state of fusion; it was merely a globe of red-hot matter, having no organic life, plant or animal. It is not my purpose, or province, to argue these theories; I simply present them as the theories of science in reference to the original condition of the earth, and either of them answers my purpose. I have

only to show that, according to science, the earth was once "without form, and void."

2. We now have a vast chaos out of which the orderly world is to be arranged, and the work proceeds. Scientific men tell us that this work of arrangement would begin with intense activity in the molecules of matter, and that this activity would at once result in light. For many years infidelity has scoffed at the idea that there was light on the first day of creation, while the sun and moon did not appear until the fourth day; and many pious people have only been able to find a refuge in the fact that it was so said in the word of God. But late discoveries in science have cleared up the mystery; and what before seemed to be an insuperable objection to the authenticity of the Bible has proved to be a triumphant vindication of it. The objection proceeded upon an erroneous theory of light. For a long time it was held that light was the emanation of an infinite number of infinitesimal particles from some luminous body; that it was a substance in itself, which was ponderable. These persons, therefore, held that there could have been no light, without the sun, from which these luminous particles could emanate. But this theory of light has given way to another known as the "undulatory theory," which says that light is simply the result of motion in a subtile substance called ether, which is universally diffused. It is not a substance, but simply an effect; and whatever may be the cause by which this ether is thus put into rapid motion, the effect will always be the same light. From this it is plain that there is

nothing unscientific in the announcement of light before the sun appeared, and especially when we consider that the intense activity of the great mass of matter was just such a cause as would have produced this effect. So we find Mr. Dana, who is second to none as authority in geological science, saying: "In such a beginning from matter in the state of gaseous fluid, the activity would be intense; and it would show itself at once by a manifestation of light, since light is a resultant of molecular activity. A flash of light through the universe would, therefore, be the first announcement of the work begun." (Man. of Geol. 742.) Moreover, it seems that this explanation is hinted at by the Apostle Paul, when he says, "God commanded the light to shine *out of* darkness" (2 Cor. iv. 6), intimating that this light arose from some source *within* the dark mass, and not from some source *without*. Or, this first light may have been chemical light, arising from the chemical processes which were going on upon the earth at this time. Chemistry tells that there are some sixty or seventy simple substances of which all things are composed. These elements are not commonly found in their simple state; they are compounded together in the various forms of matter which we have. But when these simple substances were first created, it is but natural to suppose that they existed in a pure state—unmixed with others. This state of things, however, could not long continue, for these elements have affinities for each other, and the processes of combination would at once begin; and the effect of such combination would be chemical

light. We have the plainest illustrations of this everywhere. One of these elements is potassium; but we find it in the form of potash, which is simply potassium and oxygen, or burnt potassium. So we have soda, which is sodium and oxygen, or burnt sodium. So water is hydrogen and oxygen, or burnt hydrogen. The great chemical process following upon the creation of these simple elements was combustion; and to the chemist all nature bears the marks of combustion. This gives us another explanation of this first light.

3. Here we may take up the scientific facts in reference to the atmosphere, called by Moses "the firmament." Its offices in the economy of nature are manifold. One of its most remarkable functions is to separate between the waters upon the face of the earth and those which are above the earth—the clouds. By its pressure upon the waters on the earth (which is about fifteen pounds to the square inch at the sea-level) the atmosphere helps to preserve their stability. By it the clouds are upheld. These bodies of water are formed at some distance above the earth (from seven or eight hundred yards to a mile), while below them is a comparatively dry region. This is the thing especially wonderful, and chosen by the writer of Genesis to designate the atmosphere. The clouds never form down against the earth's surface. The entire atmosphere is more or less impregnated with watery vapor; yet there is such a separation between the clouds and the seas that the atmosphere between them is comparatively dry. The atmosphere close to the earth is never saturated, else it

would rain in our houses, and stores, and churches, for the atmosphere pervades all places. Thus all comfort would be at an end, and even life itself would be destroyed. But the atmosphere divides between the earth-seas and the cloud-seas.

4. The separation of the waters from the dry land, or rather the reduction of the sea's borders, and the consequent appearance of dry land, would necessarily be among the first manifestations in the earth's history. We have seen that all the scientific theories go back to a time when the earth was but a mass of matter heated to intense heat. During this time no water could remain upon its surface; but as it cooled the water became more fixed, until it came at last to its permanent *status*, as now. In this process of cooling the surface of the earth would naturally present elevations and depressions; it would not cool in a perfectly smooth and even crust. But though the natural basins thus formed in the process of refrigeration might *now* be sufficient to accommodate all the waters on the face of the globe, yet when the waters were boiling from the intense heat of the rocky bed, they would be utterly insufficient. The water thus increased in volume would inevitably overflow even the highest mountains. So we know that the original ocean was universal, covering the entire face of the earth; but as the earth became cooler the bulk of water would become less, until the depressions in the surface would be a sufficient bed to contain all, and the land thus exposed would become dry.

5. But as yet we have no organic life; for cer-

tainly, while the earth is heated to such intense heat, it cannot furnish a home for any forms of living things—animals or plants. This boiling, scalding sea, spreading over the whole surface of the earth, forbids the thought of any existence in even the hardiest forms of organic life. So there must have been an azoic age—an age in the earth's history when there was no kind of organic life; and geology writes such among the primary rocks of the earth's crust. The interesting question now comes up, In what order do the various forms of organic life succeed each other in the scientific history when they do appear? This can only be answered from the remains which are discovered in the earth's *strata*. These testify that the types of being which they represent have lived and died, and that these types have succeeded each other in the order in which these remains appear—those in the oldest rocks being first, and those in the latest *strata* being last. According to this rule, however, it would seem that animal life was the first form that appeared, inasmuch as the first fossils found are, perhaps, those of animals. But we are not to be hasty in concluding that this is certain; for geology itself says that there might have been other forms before these, even though they cannot be traced by their fossils. This is evident from the following plain considerations: (1) It is certain that all the forms of life that have existed in the past have not been preserved in fossils. It is sometimes the case that all the fossils of a particular species have utterly perished with the exception of one single specimen. Lyell, quoting another, says: "The

late Edward Forbes remarked that few geologists are aware how large a proportion of all the known fossils are founded on single specimens." (Principles i. 148.) This is especially illustrated in the history of the bird family in geological records. No fossil of any of the feathered tribe has been found in rocks older than the oolite; yet, Lyell says: "The footprints of a great number of species of various sizes have been observed in rock of higher antiquity." (Principles i. 155.) Again: most of the azoic rocks—where there are no fossils found—are metamorphic; that is, they have undergone an entire change in their structure from extraordinary heat since they were deposited. The effect of such heat is to obliterate the fossils which may have been imbedded in them originally. Dana says: "Rocks that have been subjected to the metamorphic process have usually lost *all* their original fossils." (Manual, 706.) From these considerations it is plain that the mere absence of the fossils of plants from the lowest rocks is no proof that there were never any there. (2) But we have some positive proofs that plants were the first manifestation of organic life on the earth. To use the language of geology, as interpreted by Mr. Dana: "Supposing the existence of life of some kind, it is more likely to have been vegetable than animal. (*a*) In the progressing refrigeration of the globe, a temperature fit for vegetable life would have been reached before that which animal life could sustain. (*b*) The graphite and anthracite indicate vegetable life, if any at all. (*c*) There are among the azoic rocks slates, sandstones, quartzites, and conglomerates, which are

not more altered than some Silurian rocks containing fossils; and had mollusks and crinoids existed (then), shells and encrinites should be found in these beds." (Manual, 146.) This author gives graphite—our common black-lead—as present in these primary rocks, from which we have no fossils: these are undoubtedly of vegetable origin. So we may add to these petroleum, which is found in these same rocks. And, being able satisfactorily to account for the absence of plant-fossils from these early rocks, and finding purely vegetable substances imbedded in them, we must conclude, scientifically, that vegetable life was the first organic life in the history of the earth; and Mr. Dana so places it in his scientific cosmogony. (Manual, 743, 745.) As to the order of the various species of plants in themselves, we find some facts in botanical geology. We have this succession: cryptograms, or flowerless plants, such as the ferns, lichens, and algæ; monocotyledons, those having one seed-lobe; and dicotyledons, or polycotyledons, those having two or more seed-lobes. It shows a progression from a low order to one higher and more perfect; and this progression is plainly marked in the fossil history.

6. In reference to the appearance of the sun and moon we have some geological facts. According to the theories already mentioned, there was a time in the earth's history when its crust was intensely hot, and, as a consequence, the waters on it were heated to the boiling point. During this time the atmosphere must have been filled with a dense watery mist, or vapor. A universal cloud of steam, such

as rises from a red-hot stove when water is poured upon it, would continually ascend from the earth, and envelope it entirely in a denser fog than ever rested upon London. This would completely shut off all light from the sun and moon; and especially is this plain when we add to this watery vapor all the volatile materials—chlorine, sulphuric acid, iodine, etc.—which were also diffused throughout the atmosphere, rendering it impenetrable by the intensest light from without. The reasonableness of this is apparent from phenomena which are occurring about us still. Humboldt, in his "Observations in Peru," says: "A thick mist obscures the firmament in this region for many months. Not a planet—not the most brilliant stars of the southern hemisphere—are visible. It is frequently almost impossible to distinguish the position of the moon. If, by chance, the outlines of the sun's disc be visible during the day, it appears devoid of rays, as if seen through colored glasses. According to what geology has taught us of the ancient history of our atmosphere, its primitive condition must have been unfavorable to the transmission of light." (Cosmos, iii. 139.) This explains the objection mentioned before: "If the sun and moon were created when the earth was, why was not their light seen until the fourth day?" It was simply because this watery vapor, impregnated with all these volatile substances, was so dense that their light could not penetrate it. How long this condition of things would continue no one can possibly find out.

7 We now return to the geological order of life. Here we have no difficulty in ascertaining the certain

succession. The fossils are abundant; and they are the remains of water animals. Immediately above the rocks of the azoic age are the Silurian rocks, which cover what is sometimes called the age of mollusks, because those mollusks were the leading type of life in the age through which these rocks were deposited. This animal is an invertebrate, having no spinal column; and it is one of the lowest forms of animal life. In the first rocks of this age—those of the Potsdam *strata*—all the known forms of organic life are marine. Dana says: "Among the animals of the Potsdam period the species are all marine; none are proved to be of terrestrial life." (Manual, 179.) The same is true on to the Upper Silurian. (See Dana, Manual, 239; and Lyell, Principles i. 153.) Here, then, is the scientific dogma that water animals were in being long before any land animals.

8. Birds make their first appearance in geologic history (1) by foot-prints, in the triassic period, and (2) by fossils, in the oolitic. In other words, there are no traces of birds until long after the appearance of water animals. Lyell says: "The first appearance of fish, reptiles, and birds follows a chronological order in accordance with the position which the same classes would occupy when arranged zoölogically by a naturalist in an ascending series." (Principles i. 155.) In popular language, birds appear after both fishes and reptiles. Dana gives the same order. (Manual, 572.)

9. The appearance of land animals is subsequent to that of water animals. The first air-breathing animals known to geology are found in the Devonian age. Dana says: "Just before the Devonian

closed . . . tracks of amphibians have been observed, proving that air-breathing animals frequented the marshes." (Manual, 296.) But fishes made their appearance *abreast with* the Devonian.

10. By common consent man is the last type of life—at the highest end of the ascending series. It is not necessary to multiply authorities here. And man closes the appearance of new species. Dana asserts this in most positive language. He says: "It is not known that any new species of plants or animals have appeared on the earth since the creation of man." (Manual, 586.)

We have now passed carefully through the two records; and even a casual reader could not fail to see the agreement. The first step of the Bible record—the original creation *ex nihilo*—is, of course, beyond the reach of science. The next step—the production of light, the sun and moon not having yet appeared—is shown to be, at least, very highly probable and entirely consistent with the latest theory of light. The arrangement of the firmament, or atmosphere, also consists with what science says is a fundamental condition of the earth's preparation as a habitation for plant, animal, and man; while the Bible description of the same we find in a remarkable manner conformable to scientific truth —*dividing between the waters above and the waters beneath.* Scripture, then, records the appearance of the dry land; and, according to the most approved theories, this process would certainly result from the cooling of the earth's crust, and the reduction of the temperature of its waters. Next in order is the creation of plant-life, which, by the best scien-

tists, is placed first in the order of organic life on the globe; and the order of the species of plant-life as presented in popular language by Moses is in most wonderful accord with the botanical classification. The appearance of the sun and moon at a long period after the work of orderly arrangement began is exactly such a phenomenon as science says must certainly have occurred. The creation of marine life next is the unquestionable dogma of geology. The creation of land animals next in order is precisely what scientists say. And the appearance of man as the closing sentence of the Scripture record is confirmed by all the voices of the students of scientific cosmogony.

We must conclude, then, that, so far as the general order of succession in the forms of life is concerned, there is a most perfect agreement between the Bible and science. Surely, it would seem that Moses was not only "skilled in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," but also thoroughly conversant with the ripeness of geological research known to Dana, Lyell, and their fellow-students of our own day.

It is now proper to consider the relation of each day's work to that of the succeeding days. By the casual reader it might be concluded that each day's work was completed before that mentioned in the succeeding day was begun; that all the marine animals were created in perfection before any land animals were made at all. But this is not correct, for we find that these orders are, in part, contemporaneous. It is certain, however, that this fifth day's work had progressed a considerable time before the sixth day's work was begun.

Is there any conflict in this? We must continually bear in mind that we are not to expect to find in the Bible a specific and minute account, describing every step with that particularity which we would expect in a scientific treatise. Even geology does not afford an account perfect in every particular. "We must always bear in mind that it has been no part of the plan of nature to hand down to us a complete or systematic record of the former history of the animal world." (Lyell, "Principles," i. 147.) Dana says: "Many persons, in their study of geology, expect to find strongly-drawn lines between the ages, or the corresponding subdivisions, of the rocks. But geological history is like human history in this respect; and all attempts to divide the course of progress in man's historical development into ages with bold confines are fruitless." (Manual, 125.) Inasmuch, then, as rigid, systematic exactness is not to be found in nature or science, it cannot be expected in the Bible, which only mentions these things incidentally.

In ascertaining the relations of these divisions of the work among themselves, we must remember that the work of creation is a unit. The purpose for which it is written is simply to impress us with the idea; it is the work of God. It was not intended to present these successive fiats as separate and independent works, but simply as steps, or salient points, in one grand progression, for the perfection of which all are necessary. This is evident from the fact that the writer, in looking at them, embraces the entirety of them in one day, or time. (Gen. ii. 4.)

The designations "day the first," and "day the second," etc., in the history, are only intended to mark the *beginnings* of the different steps, while the completion of these steps, or progressions, was only reached long after. To illustrate: there are six vessels at the wharf, to sail from New York to Shanghai. They are to carry different cargoes, and to take different courses; yet they all belong to one company, and are parts of the same great enterprise which is to be consummated when they all arrive at their destination. These ships are to be put in readiness one after another, and each is to set sail as soon as its preparation is complete. The first is ready, and sails, and we say she has gone to the West Indies, Cape Horn, etc., indicating the course she is to take. Long before the first reaches the first point in her course, the second is ready, and sets sail. We say she has gone to Liverpool, Cape of Good Hope, etc., indicating the course she is to accomplish. Long before she reaches her first point, the third is ready, and sets sail. So the entire number get ready, and set out upon their way.

One might suppose, from reading an account of such an expedition, that the first ship had reached port before the second started from New York; but, with the explanation we have given, it is seen that we have only noted the *beginnings* of the voyages, and, as would be perfectly natural, we have anticipated the entire course of each vessel. They *started* at different times, but they were all out at sea together—at the same time. This is the case in the successive steps of creation. When it is said that

the waters were gathered together, and the dry land appeared, and afterward said that the plant-life was created, we are not to understand that the continents were established in any thing like their present bounds before any vestige of plant-life had being. When it is said that land animals were created on the sixth and water animals on the fifth day, we are not to understand the record to mean that the entire order of marine life was perfected before any land animals had life. The record does not teach any such thing; it only means that there were marine animals before there were land animals, and that there were land animals before man. This view is sustained by a just criticism of the text, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." The Hebrew literally reads, "In beginning God created," etc.; and I know of no rule of grammar by which the definite article is supplied. If any thing be supplied, it would be the indefinite article—"In *a* beginning," etc. But what does this mean? The word translated "beginning" is a derivation from the word which means *head*. It also is used for *a starting-point*, as in Micah i. 13, and Gen. x. 10. The same word in Syriac is so used in Heb. iii. 14, and vii. 3. So that we may read this passage, "God created the heaven and the earth in a beginning," or "in beginnings;" that is, the record of each day's work only indicates the commencements of the orders to which its work belongs.

This view seems to be further confirmed by the clause which records the close of the work. It is said, "The heavens and the earth *were finished*"—perfected. From time to time the different elements

of the work were set in motion, as the ships set sail, and at the close, on the sixth day, all were perfected—the ships had all arrived in port.

We have now to consider the question, Does the time given in the Bible agree with the time required by science for the creation and arrangement of the world's materials? Geology says this was the work of inconceivable ages. Of course it has not the *data* by which to fix the number of years, or centuries; but it can say with assurance that the world-times were vast ages. There are multiplied *strata* of rocks in the earth's crust down as far as the beginnings of organic life; and each of these has required a long stretch of time for its formation. But deep down below these, where man will never be able to measure, through the rock-ribbed earth, there are depths which we cannot measure, even by ages. How long must have been the tedious march of the ages through which these foundations were laying! This is the sober teaching of conservative science.

What does the Bible say? With all the dogmatism of some in reference to Bible-teaching on this subject, there is a most wonderful pliability of the text in the original. In the first place, the record may be preserved in all its integrity, and yet be so divided as to allow an indefinite lapse of time between the original creation and the commencement of the work of orderly arrangement. It is said, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep." This is understood by many as constituting the record of what might be called the primordial history of the

earth—the history of its creation and existence in the chaotic state. What follows may simply be the record of the work of arranging the materials into the present constitution of things. It is no objection to this that the two passages seem to be closely connected in our version: "*And* the Spirit of God moved," etc. The use of the conjunction here does not necessarily make such close connection. We find it the very first word in the book of Ezekiel rendered *now*, when there was nothing before it with which to connect what followed. We find the same word, or prefix, used in the same way in the Syriac version of the book of Jonah. These show that when used here it does not necessarily mean that the work of the six days immediately followed the original creation.

Again: the meaning of the word "day" opens up abundant room for the Bible and science to stand together. The laws of criticism by no means require that the word day shall be construed to mean the space of twenty-four hours.

1. The word in Scripture is frequently used to designate a period of time wholly indefinite, simply denoting cyclicity—the beginning, progress, and end of a thing. It means the time in which a thing has prominence. We say "Mr. Webster's day," meaning either the time of his public life or the entire period in which he lived, reaching over half a century. We find this use of the word in the Scriptures: Luke speaks of "the day of the Son of man;" St. Paul speaks of "the day of salvation" and "the day of redemption;" so in Hebrews iii. 8 he speaks of "the day of temptation in the wil-

derness," which he says lasted forty years. So Moses in this record uses it; he says: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, *in the day* that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." (Gen. ii. 4.) Here he uses the word "day" to express the entire period which before is comprised in six days, or times. Some have argued that it must mean a natural day, because of the expression, "It was evening, and it was morning," and because the Jews reckon their days so—evening and morning. But this is to beg the question, since it is more than probable that the Jews took this method of reckoning from their views of this very passage. The Hebrew words rendered "evening" and "morning" are not specific names, exclusively denoting the early and latter part of the day; they are generic expressions, and have been applied to these because they partake of the general ideas involved. The word for *evening*, in its verbal form, means *to mingle*, or *to intermix;* it also means *to be arid*, or *sterile*, out of which signification we have the word Arabia, signifying a desert-country. The word for *morning*, in its verbal form, means *to clear*, *to divide*, or *to burst forth;* and it is used of the morning because the light shoots forth. Now, taking the primary significations of these two words, we have here a beautiful designation of the creative work: "It was evening"—that is, a time of barrenness, or sterility; and "it was morning"—that is, a time of bursting forth, which followed this time of barrenness. Both of these constituted a great creative day, or period. Again, it is no objection that these days are spoken of in connection with the

Sabbath, which is to be observed as a natural day; for we find that often in Scripture a short time was observed in commemoration of a long period—as the Feast of Tabernacles, which lasted seven days, in commemoration of the forty years in the wilderness.

2. The *first* designation of the day was certainly not to mark the natural day. We have at the very beginning of the creative work the appearance of light, and we have shown that this was cosmical, or chemical, light; and yet this light was called day. So we have evenings and mornings denominated "days" three times before the appearance of either the sun or the moon. I conclude, therefore, the natural day is not meant here.

3. This meaning of the word day—an indefinite period—seems to be intimated by the apostle (James i. 17), when he speaks of God as "the Father of lights," or, more properly, "of *the* lights," the definite article being expressed. The expositions which refer this to God's being the Creator of the lights in the firmament are poverty-stricken; they make the passage exceedingly tame. There is no special force in designating God as the Father of these, and leaving out the earth on which we live; but, turning to the record of creation, we find a clew to the meaning. God created the light, and he called the light day; so we read "day the first," "day the second," etc. Now, let us substitute for *day* the word *light*. "It was evening, and it was morning—light the first;" "it was evening, and it was morning—light the second," each period being called a light. This, I believe, was the thought in the apostle's mind. Looking back to that record,

he calls God "the Father of the lights"—the sublime creative illuminations in which the successive orders of life burst forth out of the surrounding darkness and barrenness. He does not understand the "day" of Genesis in any narrow sense, but sees in it something grand and worthy of God.

Thus we have passed through this investigation, comparing the two records; and surely they seem to be in accord. The only difference between them is that they do not speak in the same tongue. Like two witnesses testifying in court who speak different languages, they seem to be saying things entirely different; but when the interpreter translates their testimony into a common tongue, they tell the same story.

THE TEMPTATION OF CHRIST.

BY THE REV S. NOLAND.

"Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. And when he had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward a hungered. And when the tempter came to him, he said, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread. But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God. Then the devil taketh him up into the holy city, and setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple, and saith unto him, If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone. Jesus said unto him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God. Again, the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; and saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me. Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. Then the devil leaveth him, and, behold, angels came and ministered unto him.—Matt. iv. 1–11.

WHAT a blessed day would that be in our life in which, from the rising to the setting of the sun, no temptation befell us. Possibly we have not lived such a day since our accountability began. Temptation is the sorest trial of our pilgrimage—our daily besetment, our unyielding foe. Still,

how few sermons have we heard explaining its evils, and prescribing the remedy. In the mind of our Lord the subject seemed so important that, in giving us his great model of prayer, we are taught to ask but for two exemptions: "Lead us not into temptation--deliver us from evil."

We designedly select our Lord's temptation, by which to explain our own. The reason is that between his human nature and ours there is a complete resemblanee, sin exeepted on his part. He was created for us with an actual body, a reasonable soul, and a mind with all its powers of reason, affection, and imagination. In behavior he is our example: "For in that he himself hath suffered, being tempted, he is able to sueeor them that are tempted." We may expect that any temptation by which he was assaulted came from the same source, externally eonsidered, was direeted with the same evil design, and was resisted and overeome by the same power through which we may stand fast in our integrity.

In the Scriptures, temptation is of two kinds: 1. The trial of our faithfulness to God; 2. An incitement in us to sin. The first is from God, and an example of it is found in his eommand to Abraham to offer up his son Isaae: "And it eame to pass after these things, that God did *tempt* Abraham" (Gen. xxii. 1); the meaning of which is that our Heavenly Father tried Abraham to see if he would obey him in offering up his beloved son. The second kind is from our own corrupt nature and from the devil, but never from God. "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be

tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man: but every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed." (James i. 13, 14.) It is with temptation in the evil sense that we have to deal to-day—Christ tempted of the devil, and we tempted like our Master.

Humanly speaking, the *place* and *time* of Christ's temptation were strange. The waters of holy baptism had just been poured upon him as part of his duty in fulfilling all righteousness; a voice from heaven was heard saying, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased;" for him "the heavens were opened," and "he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove and lighting upon him." His forerunner, John the Baptist, was ready to yield to him the work and fruits of his great revival—an immense crowd were looking on; he was about to enter on his public ministry, when instantly he was taken into solitude, left without visible support, and allowed to remain forty days in the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. After this, let us never suppose for a moment that any place is too sacred, or any religious attainment too high, to exclude the temptations of Satan. In that sermon, in which holiness to the Lord is preached to-day, may dwell unconsciously forbidden pride of the logic and rhetoric; in that hymn, the voice may be so sweet that the singer listens, forgetting to praise God; in that prayer, the tempter may beget a secret desire of style and eloquence; in that contribution, the right hand may know well enough all that the left hand doeth; in that communion, there may be intruded a feeling of "Well done, good and faithful servant."

If, at such times and places, temptation can enter, what must be its power when we are absorbed in our business or pleasures, and not on guard for our souls?

Another consideration of moment to us is the general *character* of Christ and of Satan during the forty days of the temptation. Christ was "full of the Holy Ghost," hence his strength and security. The devil is neither seen nor heard. All that time he tempted the Lord without being visible or speaking a word. Here are the two great Spirits, leading good and evil, confronted. What power and skill in both is manifest! In Christ nothing is hidden, but he lays his soul on God trustingly; in the devil all is deceit. What themes for suggestion to the human nature of Christ—for it was this nature Satan was attacking! what a place for his residence—with the wild beasts! what food around him—the trees and the stones! what a freak in his Father, when the opportune moment came at the Jordan, and all eyes were upon him, to drive him into the wilderness! what strange conduct, to declare him the Son of God from heaven, and immediately send him into solitude without sympathy, help, or promise! And if all this has happened in so short a time, what does the future augur? If all this, and greatly more, was done by Satan for forty days' time together in tempting Christ, without word or appearance, and by inward suggestion alone, what may we not expect from his wiles? Let anyone but keep up with his thoughts for a single day, and he will see how great is Satan's influence over him—what doubts, what fears, what distrust of Providence, what evil

desires, what ambition, what vanity. Satan needs no Bible full of words, from which to read the laws of pride and disobedience to God: a heart "deceitful above all things" is sufficient, and suits him best.

We come now to examine Satan's *three temptations*, and our Lord's manner of repelling them, that we may know how to overcome in like trials. In these, it will be seen that they embrace the main and leading temptations of our own lives.

First Temptation.—How soon, when the devil willed to do so, did he both appear and speak. Forty days' trial had convinced him that he could not overcome the Son of God by mental suggestions alone. He must come out from his hiding-place, and take the field in open action. He watched his opportunity. The Father allowed the Son to feel all the keenness of suffering from hunger produced by the fasting. How terrible the feeling! how severely trying on the physical nature of Jesus! At once the enemy saw the point most assailable, and began the attack. His first words to our Lord were: "If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread." He remembered that Adam had brought upon us all our ruin, by eating the forbidden fruit, and now he would have Christ repeat the offense by distrusting his Father's protection, and in making bread by his own power, and eating the same. The first word that proceeded from his mouth savored of infidelity—IF thou be the Son of God—and therefore does not deserve consideration. Again, the request came from the devil, and was intended to please him, and for this reason it should

not be granted, if for no other. In every temptation where Satan and his cause is to be benefited, there should be the most determined resistance. Further, here is a deceiver who conceals his own name, never mentioning it, and calls the name of the Son of God so doubtingly as to leave it uncertain whether he was the Son of God; and such a deceiver should be withstood. His impious request is not to *pray* for bread, but to forget God his Father, and *command* the stones to be made bread. This might be to act against his Father's will, and therefore the temptation should be repelled. We see how many and strong reasons can be given for resisting all Satan's temptations, but we are not therefore to conclude that this one in particular, and all in general, have not a great show of plausibility; and hence their danger.

Let us see, for a moment, the plausibility of this temptation. It was to exert only the power which his Heavenly Father had given; it was to satisfy the strongest demands of hunger where there could be no private injury to others; and it was to work a miracle to convince a being of strong intellectual powers. The whole act done would be corresponding to the deeds of his after-life, and in fulfillment of the course intended for him by Divine Providence; but still he refused, and why? The essence of the sin of the temptation is in trying to lead Christ to believe that his Father had forsaken him; but this the Lord did not entertain for a moment, and would literally starve to death before he would relieve his hunger with such a doubt in his mind. Apply this to our own experience. Here is a man whose bus-

iness is not so prosperous as his neighbor's; he works as hard, but his plans fail and his receipts are below his expenditures, while his neighbor is growing rich year by year. Here Satan approaches him with doubts of God's equal love between the two. He says to him, If God loved you as he loves the other, you would be as rich and as prosperous. He has surely forgotten you, and therefore you should not serve him. Why should you love a Master so unjust? And the poor tempted soul almost believes the lie! Here is a dear woman returning from the grave where she has buried a child, the darling of her heart, and as her eye falls upon another, whose child is alive and well, Satan suggests to her the inquiry, Why has God so bereaved me? and her heart is tempted to doubt the divine goodness. Many such examples might be given, but these are enough to illustrate the principle. Job may answer Satan for all such tempted ones: "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him."

Or, considering the temptation as a suggestion to exert our power wrongfully, we shall often have to apply it to ourselves. Why have a tongue, the tempter says, if we cannot speak such words as we prefer? why have such a mind as we possess, if we may not use our own reason in support of preferred themes and practices? why have wealth, if we are to be restrained from self-indulgence, and by a law of God be compelled to contribute to the poor or to his Church? why possess beauty, if it is not to be shown on every street for admiration? why have strength, if we are not to use it for boasting and victory? why have influence, and not make it the

stepping-stone of power in our own party? As Christ did not yield, what did he do? Hear his reply: "It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." These are the first words spoken by our Lord, so far as we have any information, since his baptism. See how he honors the Scriptures when he says, "It is written." He who could make scripture will not furnish any thing new for the devil, but he will go to the book of Deuteronomy, and in a place least interesting to common readers, and including a promise of deliverance to a great nation in distress, he will apply its use to a single individual when tempted to secure relief against the wicked one. He knew, and so did Satan, that "all scripture is given by inspiration of God," and with this "sword of the Spirit," and none other, will he fight. Satan felt the blow so keenly from this blade that he uttered not a word afterward in the wilderness. Christ was setting an example to his tempted followers, to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked one with this weapon of truth, and with it alone. How happy and how safe the Christian, if he can answer Satan with the word of God—if he can say, from a full heart in every providence of his life, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God," meaning that our Lord's words, understood and obeyed, are better than the food we eat, or the clothes we wear. "O how love I thy law," can he exclaim with the psalmist at the end of every temptation. How blessed is the man whom Satan can never persuade, in any emergency of

life, to doubt his Heavenly Father's goodness and care!

Second Temptation. Here every thing is diametrically opposite to the first temptation, and this will show us what a deceiver is the wicked one. There, the temptation was in a wilderness—here, in a city; there, the two were alone—here, the streets are crowded with human beings; there, neither temple nor altar was visible—here, is God's own house in Jerusalem; there, poverty and want stared them in the face—here, riches and plenty are seen; there, the wild beasts were their company—here, civilization and refinement are enjoyed; there, the plea was, Your Father has forsaken you to starvation and death—here, in a single hour's time, the devil told the Lord that he was so much under his Father's care that he could not be injured if he threw himself from the highest pinnacle of the temple, as the angels were his constant protection. How consummate and how artful the lie! How often in a single day does he shift the ground of temptation with all Christians. To-day, he so depresses the minister as to make him believe he should never again try to preach the gospel—to-morrow, he suggests that no one so eloquent can be found; to-day, he suggests to the mind the sovereignty and decrees of God to such an extent that the tempted one is led to the conclusion that man is wholly unable to move in the direction of life—to-morrow, he so lauds and magnifies man's work as to make divine grace seem unnecessary to salvation; to-day, he suggests doubts as to the divine providence extending to the man—to-morrow, he induces him to reckless

boldness without fear that the Lord will ever leave him.

Observe the place of this temptation. It is the city of Jerusalem. Satan argued that, as Adam fell in the holy garden of Eden, Christ might fall in the Holy City. It is the temple of God, and not only the temple, but the very pinnacle of the temple. Satan is said to be the "prince of the power of the air," and he will try Christ's fidelity in his own dominions. The pinnacle of the temple was not a sharp spire, but a flat space large enough for several men to stand abreast, and Josephus said the height was so great that on the southern side it was seven hundred feet to the bottom; so here was the devil tempting our Lord in our Lord's own temple and on its highest pinnacle. We see now that neither the place of baptism, nor the wilderness, nor the house of prayer, nor sacraments, nor poverty and solitude, nor company and plenty, can shield us from the temptations of the devil. The ground is neither too accursed nor too holy to be exempt from his wiles. We may expect him on each day and in every place with artful insinuations to strive to ruin our souls. To be always ready with the word of God is our only defense.

Let us now examine Satan's words. They are the first spoken by him since our Lord confounded him with "It is written." He begins with the same doubts and effrontery that he did before, saying to Jesus, "*If* thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down, for it is written 'He shall give his angels charge over thee,' and 'they shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against

a stone.'" Our Lord was now about thirty years, old, and at the age of life naturally to be ambitious. It is this part of human nature that Satan would excite. "If this be the Son of God, he can work miracles, and, among other things, he can throw himself from this height, commanding the angels to bear him in their hands; and thus descending to the ground unhurt in the presence of all Jerusalem, he can at once assert his claim to the Messiahship, and be believed." See with what holiness of purpose and show of great good to be accomplished the devil can set up his pretensions! The truth is, he did not want a man in Jerusalem to believe in Christ, but he pretended that he did. The miracle thus wrought would be to please the devil, which is always wrong. What God wills should be done by us; what the devil directs should be left undone. Even a good deed may not be done to please him, and when tempted to do such a deed, we must resist at the peril of our souls.

For the comfort of the child of God, notice Satan's *limited power*. He was standing with Christ on the pinnacle of the temple, where, if permitted, he could thrust him down; but against the Lord's will he cannot injure a hair of his head. Neither can he tempt us so strongly as to compel us to commit any sin against our will.

Observe, in the next place, *how* Satan used scripture. Our Lord had taken his quotation from Deuteronomy, in the dryest part of it, but Satan chose the Book of Psalms, the most devotional of books. He sought to give the word the same authority with which Christ invested it, by saying "It is written;"

but in this feigned piety and show of sincerity the perfidious heart of Satan is manifest, as will be seen in Psalm xci. 11, wherein an important omission of these words is detected: "to keep thee in all thy ways"—thus applying the scripture to our Lord or his followers. The promise of angelic protection is made only to those who keep in the ways of the Lord; but Satan would have Christ to believe, or the Christian, if addressing him, that the protection of angels would be granted, if he sprang from the pinnacle of the temple or did any other imprudent thing.

In replying to Satan, our Lord furnishes us an example worthy of all imitation. He does not, as he might have done, declare the passage omitted, as proof of fraudulent design on the part of the devil; but, allowing the quotation had been properly made, he answered scripture with scripture. He referred again to the book of Deuteronomy, saying: "It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." Here it is seen that the scripture quoted by our Lord is a *command*, while that used by Satan is a *promise*. Let every Christian learn from this, when tempted, that *commands* are to be observed before *promises* are to be realized. No man can expect to enjoy safety in life and happiness in heaven, because of the goodness of God, and the number of his "exceeding great and precious promises," when he is disregarding all the precepts of the Bible. The Christian may also learn in this example, when tempted by an improper use of short and isolated passages of Scripture, or parts omitted by devils or designing men, how to bring in other scriptures as

their own proper interpreter. Is it said to the Christian, by way of temptation, to prove the salvation of all men, "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," let him answer, "It is written again, 'It is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment.'" Are we tempted to believe our own works can save us by the expression, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling," let the answer be, "It is written again, 'It is God which worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure.'" Is a man tempted to a life of idleness by the expression, "Take no thought for the morrow," let the apostolic injunction be the answer, "'Not slothful in business, fervent in spirit, serving the Lord.'"

Third temptation. The true design of Satan will now be seen; his name, his motives, and his character, he has studiously avoided hitherto, but now his real purpose is quite obvious. In the two temptations already presented, he made a show of unselfishness—first, in a desire to relieve our Lord from hunger by exerting his power to make bread, and, secondly, in establishing the mission of Jesus by a great miracle; but now he seeks his *own glory by coveting the worship of Christ.* Sooner or later, this is his true desire in every temptation. He knows that man is naturally a worshiper; that the great soul within him will seek affinity with beings superior to himself; that his wants indicate the necessity of support from a power stronger and wiser than he; and that his depraved heart is ever seeking connection with evil. Hence, in tempting man, he need not show his true character or motives. He

may appear as an angel of light, in doing his worst deeds of darkness. It will answer his purposes as well if Christ will distrust his Father's protection by ceasing to rely on him, and asserting his own right and power to supply his necessities, or if he will cut short his mission in the world by one stupendous miracle, tempting God to send angelic support, as it will to have direct worship of himself; but, if the Lord will heed neither of the solicitations in the first two temptations, he will boldly approach him with the true desire of his soul, and ask to be worshiped. So, in tempting man, how seldom does Satan appear in his true nature! He knows that any thing less than the true worship of God is not acceptable; hence, any departure from it alienates the man from his Maker, and transfers him to the service of Satan. His purpose is answered if a man's life is devoted to pleasure, or wealth, or fame, or idleness, or skepticism, or practical sin. He lives with a single aim, which is to prevent the worship of God in spirit and in truth; but, to accomplish this, he will have a thousand various methods. In this last temptation of Christ, he left the city, and sought not the wilderness, but an exceeding high mountain. High places are dangerous places; they savor of pride and arrogance. Satan selected such places *twice* in tempting our Lord *three* times—the highest pinnacle of the temple, and the highest mountain. So he lifts us up to tempt us by seeking more wealth, more applause, more gayety. He does not reduce man to sickness to tempt him, or warn him that he is near the door of death, to make him sin more; but he says, "Ye

shall not surely die," and he ever promises long life.

Hear Satan's words as he tempted Christ for the last time. He omitted all suggestions that Christ might be the Son of God. Now, he sought to aggrandize himself. He prepared a regular scenic, theatrical exhibition, all unreal, hollow, and delusive. Before he spake, he filled the eye and the mind of the Saviour with his brilliant phantasms. In panoramic appearance, by his great power, in a moment's time, he showed our Lord what seemed to be "all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them." What a tempting view for an ambitious soul! How few of us, if the offer had been made of only a thousandth part of these possessions, would not have sold out, soul and body, to the devil. Consider the scene a moment. No cemetery, no grave, no sick or dying bed, no broken heart, no widow or orphan pleading for bread, no tyrant, no miser, appears in all the view; but the "kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them," in unrivaled magnificence and beauty, are beheld. It is the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them. Eden was not more lovely, but here the view is larger. Parliaments are assembled with pomp and pageantry; conquering armies are receiving the laudations of their country; scenes of festive gayety on every hand are enjoyed; youth, and beauty, and innocence, robed in white, akin to the angels, attract the eye; the whole earth is bringing forth her productions in superabundance; the oceans are all calm, and dotted with ships laden with wealth; and the world presents a gala-day of untold loveliness. In-

stantly, Satan made the offer to Christ, "All this will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me." How often are we tempted in the same way! He decks us in ribbons and lace; he paints us in gorgeous colors; he cultivates our powers of singing and oratory; he calls attention to our own symmetry; he dwells on our beauty and strength; or, going beyond ourselves, he shows us the riches of the earth, and how we may gain them—the ecstasy of applause, and how we may deserve it—the pleasures of sense, and how the appetite may be filled; and in all these things he makes the offer of them to us as if they came from himself, and not from God, ever saying, "All these things will I give thee if thou wilt fall down and worship me." Behold him tempting Christ: "We two are alone on this high mountain; no eye sees, and no ear hears, us; you can know what a great being I am from the work that I have produced. Surely, if I can create so much, I must own the work of my hands. I perceive that you, too, have a noble nature. I desire affinity and relationship with you; the secret is between us. Bend your knee, just a little, in recognition of my claims, and I will give you all." Poor, tempting devil! His possessions were as unreal and unsubstantial as the vision which he had created, and Christ knew it well. Would that we could realize as truly that whatever he offers us is a lie in its promise, and a deception in its performance.

We notice, lastly, our Saviour's reply. While he has, all the time, well known the name and character of the tempter, he has never called his name; but now he will show the wicked one that he knows

him well. He spake with an authority intended to dissolve the parleying between them: "Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." He was still hungry, but he failed not to obey God; he knew not when he should be fed, but he was full of the Holy Ghost, as he was when he was led out into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil. It was his meat and drink to do his Father's will. To worship the devil was a proposal too monstrous to be entertained. But with us, when tempted, how difficult to restrain the desire to worship him through his loveliest worldly or fleshly attractions! Still we should heed the word of God, and answer Satan, when he tempts us, "It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

The trial is over, and Christ is the victor. In his example and in his life we are safe. The slightest departure on his part had been our ruin, and the truest loyalty to him is our deliverance. Then the devil left him, and so complete was our Lord's triumph that we have no account of Satan's tempting him again, till near the close of his life. (John xiv. 30.)

When tempted, let the Christian make the conflict decisive. A doubtful battle will be renewed to-morrow. How often do we come to the engagement with prayers too feeble, faith too weak, love too cold, and relying on our own wisdom rather than the written word of God! When defeated after such inefficient resistance, we shall often have to exclaim, with a lovely saint of a past age, "Old

Satan is too strong for young Melancthon!" But, if we will "resist the devil, he will flee from us;" if we "draw nigh to God, he will draw nigh to us."

So soon as the devil departed, angels came and ministered unto Christ. What heavenly food, to appease hunger so keen and protracted! Now is he strong for duty and trust in God. So every battle won by us not only gives a blissful satisfaction in the consciousness of virtue proved, but also prepares for the next conflict, making the victory easy and sure.

Let us learn from these temptations of our Lord when, where, and how we may be attacked by Satan, and that we can surely overcome him by treasuring the word of God, thereby enabling us to reply, from some aptly-chosen passage, "It is written." May our prayer ever be, "Lead us not into temptation."

METHODISM.

BY THE REV. W. F. POYNTER.

"I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the ends of the earth."—Acts xiii. 47.

THE Methodist Church does not claim to be "*The* Church of Christ," excluding all others, and saying, "Lo, here (and nowhere else) is Christ!" She makes no pretensions to being the only apostolic Church; and while she disclaims exclusiveness for herself, she scouts the pretensions of any and all Churches who exalt themselves by arrogating to their own organizations the title of "*The Church*," or "*The Church of Christ*," or "*The Christian Church.*" Let it come from what source it may, such a claim bespeaks either inexcusable ignorance or a disgusting presumption. Shame upon the man who confines the Church of Christ to his own ecclesiastical house, or defines the boundaries of God's kingdom by any physical appointments.

We Methodists are free to confess that, as a Church, we had origin with John Wesley, having had no existence before his day. We are not ashamed of our beginning, nor of our founder. We would not presume upon the ignorance and the credulity of the masses by professing to trace our Church through the long ages to Pentecost, nor

even to an apostolic source, but are content to point to Mr. Wesley as the author, under God, of the Methodist Church, a little more than a hundred years ago. Nay, more: we rejoice in these facts.

But while we do not claim to be *the* Church, we do claim to be *a* Church—a Church of God, divinely constituted, modeled after the pattern of God's word, and built in harmony with its teachings. We make this claim, in a preëminent sense, with reference to our doctrinal character. With reference to our polity, we claim no more for it than that it does not contravene any law of God, and in all its essential elements is in accord with the teaching of Scripture. We might go further, and say that while our polity is not based, in all its *minutiæ*, on an express warrant, in so many words, yet its adaptation to the great object for which all Churches have existence has secured to it the divine favor and blessing.

The history of Methodism, if it shows any thing, proves a favorable consideration on the part of God. She entered not upon a harvest already ripened in the field; but she began in a wilderness, prepared the soil, sowed the seed, saw it grow under her own toil and watch-care, and then gathered into barns the glorious fruits. Unlike some Churches whose pretensions are bold, her present *status* has not resulted from dividing sister organizations, or from any disposition to proselyte from the ranks of others. She has contributed, during her short career, to the success of other Churches by supplying their pulpits and their pews; but it is a gratifying fact that, for the most part, her ministry have been to the "manner born."

Beginning, as the apostles began after the ascension of the Saviour, by preaching the gospel ("the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth") to the destitute and the poor, with no intention of building up a new sect, Methodism was a providential resultant. The glory of her present position is not due to a prearranged Church polity, conceived by a shrewd religionist, but to the outgrowth of a spiritual want imbedded deeply in the mind of that period. Her own stated object, "to spread scriptural holiness over these lands," has been the principle which has molded her economy, and this grand mission (the only true one of any Church of God) has been, and still is, kept prominent; it is nailed to-day to the mast-head of this noble vessel, as it boldly plows all waters. This is the watch-word of Methodism; to it every thing bends—Church polity, ceremonies, all physical appointments; and God has honored her plans, crowning her labors with a success unparalleled. If, then, the great object of all Church-organization has, in a preëminent sense, been realized under that polity, for which we claim no more than that it does not contravene any scriptural requirement, who will oppose her onward march? God has stamped his favor upon her economy; and "if God be for us, who can be against us?"

Our object in this sermon is not to defend the polity of Methodism, nor to show its adaptation to the great work of a Church, inviting though this field is, but more particularly to speak of the doctrinal character we possess, and to present some facts concerning our Creed which should com-

mend it to the favorable consideration of all thinking persons.

It may be necessary to state, as a preliminary to what we have to say, that the doctrines of Methodism are the same among all the sects into which we are divided. We mean, of course, an essential sameness—a real unity of doctrine—among the principal branches of this great people, the only difference being with the more insignificant. It is a gratifying fact that while local peculiarities have originated several different Methodist organizations, they all, with here and there an unimportant exception, have the same doctrinal basis. Our divisions have not been of a doctrinal character; other and minor considerations have occasioned these. Throughout the whole family there is a unity of faith; so when we speak to-day of the doctrines of Methodism, we represent ninety-nine one-hundredths of the entire number of Wesleyans in the world.

In presenting you the doctrinal character of Methodism, we will notice, first, that which we conceive to be the glory of our Church—viz.:

I. *The Catholicity of her Creed and Practice.* We claim for our Articles of Religion that while they embrace every doctrine which Protestants in common hold as essential to a godly life here and salvation hereafter, on minor matters, and such as have no material bearing upon character, and such as minister strife with no practical benefit, they are silent, or allow the largest liberty of opinion. The great error of other Churches, and especially of those in earlier times, has been to lay down opinions upon all questions, and require individual notions to

be conformed thereto; and it has remained for the Methodist Church alone to pursue the opposite course. The great object of Mr. Wesley in drafting the Creed of Methodism was to embody in it only the common belief of Protestantism, so that all Christians might stand upon it. Those who accept the word of God are not divided in opinion upon fundamental doctrines of religion—the existence of God, the mediation of Christ, salvation through him; upon these and such all agree, and it was the aim of our leader to incorporate none others in his formula of doctrine. Do not understand me as stating that we have, as a Church, no opinion upon any other question. We have a distinctive theology, as we shall show presently; but what I mean is that our Articles of Religion contain only the essentials of a proper faith, and ignore those doctrines about which there is useless controversy. So well has this end been attained that, with a few unimportant exceptions, every Article in our Creed is indorsed by the Protestant world. Our Baptist brethren might except to the clause in our Seventeenth Article: "*The baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church.*" But the insertion of this expression is one of the strongest proofs of the catholicity for which we are contending. When our Articles were made, eighteen-twentieths of Protestantism and seventy-eight-eightieths of Christendom believed in and practiced infant baptism, and the proportion is the same to-day. In framing a creed which should embrace a common faith, this question could not be ignored. To leave out all reference to it would have done violence to the cherished convictions of

millions of Christians; and yet the few who believe the practice had no divine warrant must not be slighted. Hence the phrase under consideration, "The baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church"—the practical meaning of which is that to all who desire it their children are to receive baptism, while those who deny its advantages will not be required to submit thereto. As a Church, we hold to the baptism of young children; as ministers, we defend the practice, and urge upon the people its advantages to their children in restraining them from vice, and leading them into paths of holiness. But it is not a *sine qua non* to Church-membership; it is not made a condition of entering into or remaining in the Church. The expression is placed in the Article in question for the benefit of that very large class who hold infant baptism to be a heaven-born privilege with which they will not dispense; but its bearing upon those of contrary views is not coercive.

Our friends of "*The Christian Church*" will, in addition to holding the objections just noticed, also enter a protest against our Ninth Article, which teaches the doctrine of justification by faith only; for they contend that justification, or pardon of sins, is conditioned not upon faith only, but upon faith, repentance, and baptism—the last two being as essential to acceptance with God as the first one. We might pause to show those who hold this tenet that this doctrine separates them from Protestantism and allies them to popery. Justification by faith only is the central truth of Protestantism; baptism as a necessary prerequisite to pardon is essentially Romish.

But, admitting their views to be correct, we teach repentance and practice baptism, and whatever benefit inheres in either or both we have. And this is admitted every time an immersed person of the Methodist Church is received into the Christian Church, for they do not require him to be reïmmersed; so that practically our brethren of this persuasion need not object to the Article under consideration. With these exceptions, and perhaps one or two more as trivial, our Articles necessarily receive the indorsement of every Protestant.

The position assumed will be still more patent by considering the relation of our Articles to the Calvinistic controversy. For ages has the Christian world been wrangling over the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation, and been divided into warring parties thereon. And while it is a doctrine whose acceptance or rejection would influence character, yet as both parties insisted on faith in Christ and purity of heart and life, and thus practically agreed as to what constituted a godly life, it pleased Mr. Wesley to omit any reference to Calvinism in his Articles of Religion. He wisely saw that upon points of this kind men might differ, and yet be holy in character. It is not essential to a religious development that a man should believe in Calvinism or its opposite; hence the whole question, at least in its boldest outline, is relegated to the individual. Let him believe as he pleases on this subject, as long as he "holds to the Head, Christ Jesus." Calvinists can live, have lived, in communion with the Methodist Church without any violence to their private sentiments, because, while the Church is Armin-

ian in its theology, its Articles of Religion ignore the subject. This is a fair sample of the spirit of our Creed. It embraces essentials, and ignores all useless questions.

The practice of the Church is in harmony with the catholicity of her Articles of Religion, holding forth a liberal hand to all. Look at her relations to the baptismal controversy. She beholds the people of God—who have a work in hand as grand as God is exalted, who are the exponents of principles of infinite value to mankind—pausing in the midst of wondrous responsibilities to wrangle over the amount of water to be used in baptism, disputing in bitter terms about the *form* of an ordinance, losing sight of its *spirit* and forgetting its lessons. Methodism says to this warring mob, "Cease your strife; cast away your bickerings; end your disputes; let each man receive baptism as he conceives to be the scriptural mode." The wisdom of such an attitude cannot be questioned. The class of minds who are troubled over such a subject cannot be better reached than by allowing a liberty of choice in this and kindred matters; and the Church can afford to be all things to all men when no principle is sacrificed.

Her liberality is seen again in the manner of the reception of members into her communion. No doctrinal tests are required, no fealty to any particular Church tenets enjoined; a simple desire to flee the wrath to come and to be saved from sin, a promise to live a godly life, and an assent to the "Creed of Christendom," "the Apostles' Creed" —these are the conditions imposed, and none other.

Surely the demand of the day, for a Church whose doctrinal basis is sound enough to uphold all Protestantism, and whose ecomony is elastic enough to embrace the largest liberty of opinion—a Church whose creed contains only the essentials and ignores the non-essentials, whose practical working is catholic and liberal—such a demand is met in the Methodist Church, and there alone.

This catholicity was Mr. Wesley's boast. In the eighty-fifth year of his age, in Glasgow, speaking of Methodism, he uses the following language, which is but a sample of many utterances to the same effect: "There is no other religious society under heaven which requires nothing of men in order to their admission into it but a desire to save their souls. Look all around you; you cannot be admitted into the Church, or Society, of Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Quakers, or any others, unless you hold the same opinions with them and adhere to the same mode of worship. The Methodists alone do not insist on your holding this or that opinion, but they think and let think. Neither do they impose any particular mode of worship, but you may continue to worship in your former manner, be it what it may. Now, I do not know any other religious body, either ancient or modern, wherein such liberty of conscience is now allowed or has been allowed since the age of the apostles. Here is our glorying, and a glorying peculiar to us. What Society shares it with us." (Tyerman, vol. iii. 533.) The Methodist Church to-day, eighty-six years since this challenge was thrown out, is still without a rival in this glorious peculiarity.

We come now to notice another feature of Methodism, no less peculiar than the one already elaborated—viz.:

II. *The Harmony of her Theology.* We have a distinctive theology. Though our Articles of Religion are so framed as to allow the widest freedom of opinion consistent with an essential faith, so that any Christian may find a place in our Church without violence to his individual sentiments, yet we have a theology of our own—a complete system of doctrines belonging to Methodism alone. Mr. Wesley was a profound theologian, as well as a great revivalist; and though his forces were directed to a resuscitation of religious life rather than to perfecting a theological system, still he handed to his followers a theology which to-day is one of the four systems into which all Christendom is divided, and is rapidly taking precedence of all others in the popular mind.

A German work of some note ("Systematische Theologie") says: "There are four great, complete Christo-theological systems. . . . They are the Roman Catholic, the Calvinistic, the Lutheran, and the Wesleyan. . . Besides these four there is no other worthy of notice. . The Greek Church has as yet formed no definite, regular system of doctrine, and, so long as she retains her present views, can form none which can radically differ from Romanism. The Church of England has much less a peculiar, complete system. Her theology is a mass of discordant elements. Her books of doctrine are appealed to by Calvinists and Arminians, Puritans and Puseyites, Evangelicals and Sacramentarians,

High and Low Churchmen, with about equal propriety." (See Stevens' "Centenary of Methodism," 142.) The distinguished author then proceeds to show the fundamental contrarieties of these four systems, and closes with a well-deserved tribute to the superiority of the Wesleyan over all others. It is not our purpose to compare extant theologies, but, assuming the Wesleyan to be among the number which are demanding the acceptance of the world, we assert that it alone is an harmonious system—that it possesses in itself no warring tenets, but presents perfect concord in all its utterances. We contend that the Wesleyan theology has no conflicts in its various teachings, but that its parts fit into each other as the integral portions of a well-regulated machinery. We are not now insisting that we are right and all others are wrong, but that, true or false, our system is an harmonious system, and that it stands alone in this peculiarity. One illustration shall suffice. The creed of all Calvinistic Churches teaches that, by a decree made before the worlds were, a certain number of the race were chosen for eternal salvation, and the remainder devoted to everlasting despair; and this selection was not based on the character of the individual, but grew out of the sovereign pleasure of God alone. And, strange as it appears to us, side by side with this utterance, and in the same chapter, stands the doctrine affirmed that man is a free moral agent. Two doctrines more at variance cannot be found; two theories more conflicting have never been conceived. Here is a discord which no logic can harmonize; and this is a fair sample of all theological systems, save that known

as Wesleyan. No such irreconcilable tenets are found among her doctrinal utterances. She has taken a view of man's relation to God through Christ and the salvation guaranteed to him, which enables her to eonstruct a theological house whose foundations are deep and broad, and the superstructure built thereon proportioned and beautiful. An harmonious theology—this is the claim made. Who can deny it? who can discover its jarring elements? We throw out this thought for reflection, and not for discussion in this sermon. We simply assert it as a fact. In passing from this part of the subject, we pause to remark (*a*) that from the stand-point of Methodist theology alone ean a theodicy be construeted in aeeord with right reason, a true psychology, and with this word; and (*b*) that the belief of the very large majority of Christians in all Churches is Methodistic. The heart of the Christian world is Wesleyan—so true is it that our doctrines commend themselves by their own consistency to the acceptance of all.

We notice, in the next place, the grandest peeuliarity of our Church—viz.:

III. *Its Spirituality.* As already intimated, the Methodist Church is the ontgrowth of a deep-seated religious want, and not the result of a preconceived ecclesiastical theory. Mr. Wesley's main purpose was to revive religion, and not to found a Church. He consequently preached religion—personal, experimental religion; he exalted the spirituality of God's service; he taught, or rather rescued from ritualism, those great apostolic doctrines of spiritual regeneration—the witness of the Holy Spirit, and a

growth in grace. These were his special themes, and never did a man embody in his own experience more fully the doctrines he preached than did John Wesley. He was a spiritual man; his life was a living comment on the truth of a direct communion of the soul with its God; and he stamped this doctrine upon the Church which grew out of his preaching, as its special privilege. Other Churches have the "new birth" and the "witness of the Spirit" in their catechisms; but it has remained for Methodism to insist upon these as essential to a religious experience and a holy life, to urge that they must be interwoven into the texture of individual character if it would stand the great test of God's scrutiny. She has taught that there can be no true development separate from these fundamental principles. She has thundered along the lines of a godless Church-membership the terrible truth, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." She has pointed the trembling penitent to the high privilege of the humblest one: "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit that we are the children of God." She has sent the sinner to the altar of prayer to agonize for these deeper manifestations of God's power. She has insisted upon the Christian's knowing, by an earnest consciousness, that he has passed from death unto life. Laying little stress upon ordinances and external conformity to Church ceremony, she has demanded of every one that, individually, he must come to Christ and find him a personal Saviour. "Create in *me* a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within *me*," is the prayer she has taught her numerous children to utter,

as expressive of the greatest want of life. Thus has the ax been laid at the root of the tree of unrighteousness. As a result of this spiritual preaching—this insisting upon an experimental religion as preparatory to all proper Christian development—her people have been, for the most part, a praying people—praying for the Holy Ghost in his convicting, converting, and sanctifying influence; and, as a consequence of this, Methodism has been the great revivalist of the last one hundred years. Through her instrumentality millions have been born into the kingdom of God, who have taken their Church relations in all the various Churches of the land. Of all her peculiarities her spirituality is the one which has marked her out as *the* conservator of religious life and godly character, and it is the one in which we should most glory.

Having noticed these three features of Methodism—her catholicity, harmony of theology, and her spirituality—allow us to briefly allude to what she has been enabled to accomplish, the success which has crowned her labors, her present *status*, and her future possibilities.

From the tables annexed to this sermon, it will be seen that the Methodist is the youngest of all the Churches except one. She is one hundred and twenty-seven years younger than the Baptist, one hundred and eighteen years younger than the Congregational Church, and sixty-three years younger than the Presbyterian; while the Catholic, Episcopal, and Lutheran are as old as immigration to these shores. Notwithstanding this, she is by far the largest Church in the land, being more than one

million stronger than the next largest Protestant Church, and at least eight hundred thousand larger than her great rival, the Catholic Church. This has been accomplished, too, without dividing any other Church to increase her own strength. The "Christian Church" has a creditable showing for her age; but her success is due largely to the fact that Mr. Campbell divided the Baptist Churches in those sections where this Church has gained a foothold, and absorbed the "New Lights," and thus had a strong beginning, while the Methodist has gathered her numbers from the world. Let it be remembered, too, that in the statistics given none but communicants are counted. It is sometimes alleged by ignorant and prejudiced people that Methodists count their baptized children among their membership, but such is not the case.

The first Methodist Church in the United States was organized in 1766, with five members; the first Conference was held in 1773, with one thousand one hundred and sixty members reported. To-day, one hundred and one years from the date of organization, that little band has increased to the great number of two million eight hundred and ten thousand six hundred and eleven! while in the world she has a membership of four million. Not only has her numbers increased, but she has gone forward in all departments of Church-work. Her money power is almost fabulous. She raised in 1873, for support of ministry, building churches, and other Christian work, more than twenty-five million dollars, or nearly ten dollars to each communicant! The census table annexed shows that in 1870 she had one-

third of all the Church-organizations in the United States; one-third of all the church-edifices were hers she seated more than one-fourth of all the church-going people; one-fifth of all the church-property in the land was in her name; and she has built, on an average, nearly two churches per day for the last twenty years! Other tables in the census give us information as follows: In twenty-two of the thirty-seven States in the United States, the Methodist Church is first in numbers; in eleven others she is second; in three others she is third; in one (Rhode Island) she is fifth. The Roman Catholic is first in five States; the Baptist is first in six States; and the Congregational in four States. There are only one hundred counties in all the States in which the Methodist Church has no congregation. The hosts of Methodism, and her great resources, are under the finest organization and completest discipline. Over the whole, as overseers of the entire field, are about twenty-five Bishops, traveling throughout the length and breadth of the land, directing the mighty agencies of the Church. Under these are at least eight hundred Presiding Elders, with particular districts to watch and cultivate, as sub-Bishops, and reporting to their superiors, annually, the condition of their respective fields. Under these, again, are sixteen thousand traveling preachers, more or less, and twenty thousand local preachers, all, or nearly all, of whom have a specified work—there being no effective preachers who desire work unemployed, and no Church and no section of the country without oversight. It may be truly said that every square foot of territory in this great country of ours is em-

braced in some circuit, station, or district of Methodism. The day is not distant when not only this land, but all lands, shall be enveloped in the network of this ever-active and progressive Church. Already her missionaries are in all climes, and her missionary operations are belting the globe. While we write these lines, several Bishops are in distant fields, inspecting the outposts and making arrangements for advances into the enemy's dominions. The mind grows giddy in contemplating the possibilities of Methodism. Already, when the first century has just gone, she preaches to more than one-fourth of the population of the United States, having eleven millions of the people of this land under her influence. How grand is her future! The population of the United States is now forty million. In forty years more, it is estimated, we shall number one hundred million, and in seventy years the population will have reached two hundred and fifty million! It is startling to think of this host of people, greater than now live under the kingdoms of Europe, crowded between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans—citizens of America; and yet the child born to-day may live to see it. What is to be the religion of this vast multitude? What Church is to mold the sentiments of this mighty population? We say it boldly, that the history of the past, and her present position, together with the adaptation of her economy to carry the gospel to all classes, say, as plainly as if revealed, to Methodism, "*I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation to the end of the earth.*" It is certain that the Church of the future is either the Meth-

odist or the Roman Catholic, and we believe that the statistics given herein clearly show that victory is already on the side of that best type of Protestantism, our glorious Methodism. But the end is not yet. Catholicism is concentrating her forces in America. Her diplomacy, made shrewd by ages of use, will compass every conceivable resource to take these fair fields into the spiritual fold of the Vatican. She is landing her hordes upon our shores. At central points, on the most eligible positions, she is building her churches, schools, and humane institutions. Wise in financial plans, she looks forward into the future, and makes provision for its every contingency. Her energy, shrewdness, ample resources, far-reaching policy, have excited, and do still excite, the alarm of all friends of free America, especially in view of the political combinations of Europe, which daily restrict the influence of popery in the Old World. Intelligent men are looking to the Methodist Church as the ecclesiastical power competent to counteract the devices of Catholicism. Her theology, harmonious and reasonable; her Articles of Religion, including essentials and ignoring all others; her economy, so well adapted to train the masses in the truths of the gospel, and so elastic as to cover the land with the agencies of religion; her unparalleled success — all proclaim her to be the Church which, in the great conflict between popery and Protestantism, is to lead and control the forces of the truth. Other Churches will live on and flourish, but in this contest, which must surely come, the burden must fall on Methodism. The duty of Methodists, in view of these facts, is plain and imperative.

Let them awake to an appreciation of the great work committed to them—to the responsibilities imposed upon their Church. Let each one know the possibilities of Methodism in the future, and his individual connection with its success or failure; support its institutions of learning; succor its missionary operations; aid its every agency for preaching the word of God; but, above all, be religious; maintain your individual acceptance with God; enjoy communion with him; hold forth that grand peculiarity of Methodism, its spirituality; and always be living epistles of the power of the Holy Ghost to convert and sanctify the nature of man. The hosts of Methodism, knowing their high prerogatives, ambitious to attain to the utmost usefulness, and at the same time maintaining their personal religious experience, hold the conquest of the world in their hands. May God enable every one to do his full duty

---

The table on the following page is taken from the United States Census, 1870, Vol. I., page 526, Table XVII. (B), and shows, the congregations, churches, sittings, and value of Church-property in 1850, 1860, 1870:*

* By reference to page 501 of the Census, it will be found that the statistics of the Methodist Church, as published in her own tables, are verified by the Census; and a high compliment is paid her economy in the agreement of her reports with the official returns made to the Census Bureau—an agreement found with but a few of the Churches.

DENOMINATIONS.	1850.			1860.			1870.			
	Churches.	Sittings.	Property.	Churches.	Sittings.	Property.	Organizations.	Edifices.	Sittings.	Property.
Baptist	9,563	3,307,211	$11,173,970	12,151	4,044,218	$21,079,114	15,829	13,962	4,360,135	$41,608,198
Christian *	875	303,780	853,386	2,068	681,016	2,518,045	3,578	2,822	865,602	6,425,137
Congregational	1,725	807,355	8,001,995	2,234	956,351	13,327,511	2,887	2,715	1,117,212	25,069,698
Episcopal	1,459	643,598	11,375,010	2,145	847,296	21,665,698	2,835	2,601	991,051	36,514,549
Evangelical Associated	39	15,479	118,250	.....	.....	.....	815	641	193,796	2,301,650
Friends	726	280,323	1,713,767	726	269,084	2,544,507	692	662	224,664	3,939,560
Jewish	36	18,371	418,600	77	34,412	1,135,300	189	152	73,265	5,155,234
Lutheran	1,231	539,701	2,909,711	2,128	757,637	5,385,179	3,032	2,776	977,332	14,917,747
Methodist	13,302	4,345,519	14,825,070	19,883	6,259,799	33,093,371	25,278	21,337	6,528,209	69,854,121
Miscellaneous	122	36,494	214,530	2	630	4,000	27	17	6,935	135,650
Moravian	344	114,988	444,167	49	20,316	227,450	72	67	25,700	709,100
Mormon	16	10,880	84,780	24	13,500	891,100	189	171	87,838	656,750
New Jerusalem	21	5,600	115,100	58	15,395	321,200	90	61	18,755	869,700
Presbyterian	4,858	2,089,954	14,571,339	6,406	2,565,949	26,841,525	7,824	7,071	2,698,244	53,265,256
Reform Church, Dutch and German	676	343,618	5,110,066	1,116	484,765	6,876,520	1,727	1,613	658,928	16,134,470
Roman Catholic	1,222	667,863	9,256,75	2,550	1,404,437	26,774,119	4,127	3,806	1,990,514	60,985,566
Second Advent	25	5,250	11,100	70	17,120	101,170	225	140	34,555	306,240
Shaker	11	5,150	39,500	12	5,200	41,000	18	18	8,850	86,900
Spiritualist	.....	.....	.....	17	6,275	7,500	95	22	6,970	100,150
Unitarian	245	138,067	3,280,822	264	138,213	4,338,316	331	310	153,471	6,282,675
United Brethren	14	4,650	18,600	.....	.....	.....	1,445	937	265,025	1,819,810
Universalist	530	215,115	1,778,316	664	235,219	2,856,095	719	602	210,884	5,692,325
Unknown (Local Miss.)	22	9,425	98,950	.....	.....	.....	26	27	11,925	687,800
Unknown (Union)	999	320,454	915,020	1,366	371,899	1,370,212	409	552	153,202	965,295
Grand totals	38,061	14,234,825	$87,328,801	54,009	19,128,751	$171,397,932	72,459	63,082	21,665,062	$354,483,581

* The statistics here given opposite the name "Christian" include two distinct Churches, "Christian" and "Disciples of Christ." The former is estimated, in 1870, to have 1,100 Church-organizations, 1,050 churches, 100,000 Church-accommodation, $735,000 value of Church-property. This would give the "Disciples of Christ," or "Camphellites," 2,478 organizations, 1,772 churches, 765,602 accommodation, $5,690,135. (See Census, page 505.)

Table showing date of organization and present (1874) numerical strength of the principal Churches in the United States, taken from latest reports of the Churches themselves, and from the Census of 1870:

NAME OF CHURCH.	DATE OF ORGANIZATION IN UNITED STATES.	JAN. 1, 1874. NUMBERS.
Methodist	1773	2,810,611
Catholic*	Settlement of the country	1,990,514
Baptist	1639	1,585,232
Presbyterian	1703	714,979
Lutheran	Settlement of the country	487,195
Congregationalist	1648	312,054
"Disciples" †	1820 to 1835	244,912
Episcopal	Settlement of the country	239,218
Reformed		171,543
United Brethren		125,464

* We have allowed the Catholic Church as many communicants as she has Church-accommodation, which is three times the average of other Churches. We have done this for the reason that her churches for the most part are in central localities, while her membership is scattered all over territory without churches. The estimate is a liberal one, and it cannot be that she has more members in the United States than here granted.

† The "Disciples," or "Christians," or "Campbellites," publish no statistics. We have arrived at the figures given above by comparing the statistics given in the Census as to Church-organizations, edifices, etc., of this Church with the same items of Churches whose membership we know. The calculations on this basis must approximate, at least, the truth. According to the Census, page 505 (and the estimate can be verified by anyone with the reports of the several Churches and the Census before him), the Baptists average 80 communicants to a Church-organization; the Methodists, 90; the Presbyterians, 98; the Reform Church, 132; the Evangelical Association, 74. Knowing the Church-accommodation of the "Disciples," as

taken from the Census, pages 505 and 526, we can easily calculate their membership on the basis of the above averages. For instance, as compared with the Baptists, the "Disciples" have 198,240; with the Methodists, they have 223,020; with the Presbyterians, 242,844; with the Reformed Church, 327,096; with the Evangelical Association, 183,372. The average of all these is 234,912. Adding 10,000 for increase since the Census, we have 244,912.

KENTUCKY STATISTICS.

Baptists, 88,873; Methodists, 81,370; Disciples, 52,910; Presbyterians, 14,339; Episcopalians, 3,827.*

*These Kentucky reports are believed to be official.

THE ATONEMENT: ORIGIN AND REMEDY OF EVIL.

BY THE REV. S. W. SPEER, D.D.

"For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost. —Matt. xviii. 11.

"Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus."—Rom. iii. 24.

THE unity of the divine government over a diversity of existences has in all ages arrested the attention of the thoughtful and reflecting. Mankind has not stumbled in regard to the physical objects of God's natural government. The connection between cause and effect is easily traced, although the agencies employed to accomplish these grand results, which are seen in every department of nature, are not readily defined and comprehended; yet they can be traced with much accuracy and precision, and it is not difficult to note the effects of light, heat, electricity, and gravitation.

The origin of evil and the means of its eradication appear to be the perplexing problems to the human mind. The fact that moral as well as physical evil exists in the world stands confessed in all ages. Scientific men have attempted to explain its existence by hypotheses. That evil does exist is a matter of sad experience as well as of true history. We can trace it only in history; and the only his-

tory that claims to be of divine authority is the Bible. It contains the oldest literature known to man; it claims to be the word of God, communicated by divine inspiration to holy men, indicating the means of correcting the wide-spread evils of sin and error existing in the world through the system of grace it reveals. This Book has for ages successfully withstood and repelled all the assaults of skepticism and infidelity; it has triumphantly resisted the sophistries and pretentious assumptions and hypotheses of rationalists and scientists.

The Bible indicates, with unmistakable precision, that in the early history of the first man and woman there was a disruption of the moral relation which they sustained to the divine Ruler, in which they became guilty and lost their pristine virtue and purity. The history is short, simple, explicit, and affecting. They disobeyed God, were condemned to death, and expelled from the garden. The great apostle says: "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned"—in the first man, the federal head and representative of the human race: "As in Adam all die." On this subject the sacred record gives abundant testimony. Milton says:

> Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit
> Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
> Brought death into the world, and all our woe,
> With loss of Eden.

In the fact of man's apostasy and fall is found the necessity of the interposition of the divine clemency.

Before the guilty pair were expelled from the gar-

den a gracious intimation was given them that their seducer should be vanquished by the Seed of the woman; thenceforth there was to be an unabated contest between virtue and vice, truth and error, the true religion and irreligion, until the final triumph of the promised Deliverer.

The struggle began at once; the outcropping of the deadly evil was witnessed in the first family in the immediate vicinity of the place in which God had seen fit to talk with the first pair.

Abel was the representative of truth, virtue, and religion; he rested his hopes of mercy and divine favor upon the first promise, which may be summarized: "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." Actuated by faith in this foreshadowed mercy, "Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts." Abel "brought of the firstlings of his flock," and thereby recognized the fact that without the shedding of blood there can be no remission, and through this typical offering looked for mercy through the Seed of the woman.

Cain, on the contrary, brought an offering of the fruits of the ground as a token of gratitude for the temporal good which he had received from the hand of Providence, and by which act he repudiated the only hope of mankind as a medium of access to the divine Father. Jesus said, ages afterward: "I am the way, the truth, and the life, and no man cometh to the Father but by me." Since the days of Abel until the present time there have been those who have been wise in their own eyes,

who have trusted in their own piety and good deeds, with an occasional reference to infinite goodness as a token of respect, but who have systematically and persistently rejected Jesus Christ as the only Saviour and Mediator between God and man. Arianism and Socinianism, with all their cognate ramifications, have attempted to disparage and destroy the atonement made by Jesus Christ. The efforts of Renan, Colenso, Strauss, and Huxley, and many professed ministers of the gospel, evince that they are the enemies of Christ, and teach doctrines antagonistic to the Scriptures, which assert that "Christ crucified is the power of God and the wisdom of God."

The history of the past ages not only discloses the conflicts of humanity with the depressing problem of moral evil, but it unfolds the many and various efforts made by the distressed and guilty to appease the anger of the unseen and offended Deity by gifts, penitence, and sacrifices. The records of the past, both sacred and profane, attest the inveterate tendency of the human mind to sin and error. The evil has been found in all lands, in all climes, among all tribes and nations. None have been found by nature pure and virtuous, but everywhere the same tendency to corruption and crime.

The Scriptures affirm that all these evils are consequent upon the sin of one man, and that one man was Adam, and no one else; that in him all die. No mathematical truth could be enunciated more explicitly; the fact, the person, and the sequence, are named, described, and defined; no myth, no confusion of ideas. The history of past

ages is a commentary upon the man, his sin, and its results.

However difficult it may be to define the manner in which the evil act infused its poison throughout every power of Adam's mind and soul, and how it was communicated to all his posterity, yet it is as easy to explain this and understand it as to understand how physical death has been entailed upon the race by the same act. Both facts are plainly stated by St. Paul: "As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." The origin of evil has no other authentic historic account. Hypothesis will not satisfy the condition of the question. If, then, all have sinned, are by nature the children of wrath, without hope and without God in the world, dead in trespasses and in sins, what remedial system obtains in the moral government of the world by which God may uphold the justice of his throne and justify the ungodly? No question was ever propounded to the human mind that possessed greater breadth of interest to man. The present and the future combine to intensify the magnitude of the question. The undying remorse of the guilty conscience of the incorrigibly impenitent, and the "far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory" of the inheritance of the saints in light, can alone give us the full answer to the value of this question. As to the means by which sin may be forgiven, by which God may "be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus," the solution is to be found in the history of redemption through Jesus Christ. Natural religion, with all

its analogies and sublime teachings, does not give any clew to this subject; it affords no relief to the guilty. In the natural world there does not exist an object which can be presented to infinite justice as a ground, or reason, for pardon. The sacrifices offered by Jews and pagans were confessions of weakness and guilt, and adumbrated their necessities and desires. All the means that man can appeal to in the great temple of the universe will fail to meet his wants or relieve his fears.

To sustain the divine government, it was needful to render sin odious, that moral beings might see and feel how hateful and abhorrent sin is in the sight of God. This has been accomplished in the death of Jesus Christ. "God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us," "sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin condemned sin in the flesh."

The Father represents himself as the moving cause of human redemption in the gift of his Son, and Jesus Christ as the procuring cause: "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." No other means could have been employed to save sinners. Means of less value could not have availed; a greater gift than the Son of God could not have been offered. If means of less value could have accomplished the end, then it would argue a want of wisdom to employ the greater when the less would have secured the end. God is infinitely wise, and cannot err. He so loved the world that he gave his Son for its redemption. No greater

gift was at his disposal. "Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."

It is proper now to inquire into the person, offices, acts, and sufferings of Him who came to give his life a ransom for all. Had he been a mere man, his intervention would have been unavailing; in this case it would not have been possible for him to have done any thing beyond his personal obligation to obey the divine law. Had he been an archangel, he could have accomplished nothing; and besides that, angelic nature cannot have full sympathy with unlike beings; hence, "he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High-priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." We must appeal to the law and to the testimony for a satisfactory solution of this subject. However mysterious and incomprehensible the doctrine of the Trinity may be to the human mind, yet the fact is stated in terms which are clear and explicit. In the unity of the Godhead is the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, coëqual and coëternal. It is stated that God sent his Son into the world, that the world through him might be saved. This doctrine is set forth in sundry places in the Holy Scriptures; it has been formulated and announced by the Church of God from the beginning. The Word, who was in the beginning, who was with God, and who was God, "was made flesh, and dwelt

among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth." The Son of God assumed human nature. So, as to the person of Jesus Christ, he was the Son of God and the Son of man—very God and very man. There was no confusion of natures; the humanity was not changed into the divinity, nor was the divinity changed into humanity. There was such a personal union between the human and divine natures as to constitute the one Christ. As to his humanity, Jesus "was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death."

The fact of his temptation does not prove nor indicate any liability to sin. "For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted." "Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession. For we have not a high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." "For such a High-priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens."

All this testimony indicates the immaculate purity of Jesus, and his impeccable nature. Had Jesus been a mere man, or created being, then his liability

to sin would have been probable; but such was not his nature. He was divine as well as human—the Son of God as well as the Son of man; "so that two whole and perfect natures—that is to say, the Godhead and manhood—were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man." This was as true of him when he lay in the manger before the adoring *magi*, as when he ascended on high, leading captivity captive, amidst adoring seraphim and cherubim, and sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.

The mission of Jesus Christ into this world was to do and suffer the will of his Father in behalf of humanity. "Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt offerings and sacrifices thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo I come to do thy will, O God;" and to his sorrowing mother he said (when young), "Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" In his agony he said, "Not as I will, but as thou wilt;" and to his disciples he said, "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory;" and again, "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer."

The divinity never forsook nor left the humanity any further than to permit this suffering, temptation, anguish, and death, as the innocent, sinless, willing Substitute for guilty man. On the cross he exclaimed, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" This abandonment was not to leave Jesus bereft of virtue, but to feel and endure the pains of death, as he had voluntarily given himself to die in

man's stead and room—*that he should taste death.* It was necessary for Jesus to be tempted, to die in our stead, to offer himself without spot to God. It was not necessary for Jesus to sin, and his very nature shut him up to a life of purity and holiness.

Again: "Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man." "God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto him. The Father loveth the Son, and hath given all things into his hand." "No man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." So intimate was Jesus with the Father, that it is said, "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." And again, "I and my Father are one."

Let us now turn our attention to the acts of Christ, the Lord our Righteousness, our priestly Melchisedec, "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." The Scriptures clearly demonstrate that man is in a state of trial, and under a system of mercy. The atonement made by the death of Jesus Christ for sinful men is represented in the Christian system as the means by which mankind may be delivered from guilt and sin—from the judicial inflictions of the righteous displeasure of God, whose authority has been contemned, and whose law has been violated. The intervention of Jesus Christ as Mediator between God

and man sustains the honor of God's law, and at the same time exhibits the divine clemency to the guilty and erring. God can now "be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

Atonement signifies to make at one, to reconcile. We "joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement." It implies satisfaction for sin. "For by one offering he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified," through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. The atonement results from the substitution of the innocent for the guilty—the suffering of the just for the unjust. God freely gave his Son to die for the sinful race, and Christ willingly yielded his life a ransom for all. The value of this sacrifice is to be found in the dignity and worth of the Son of God, and in the adaptation of his humanity to suffer the penalty due to sin. The personal union of the two natures was necessary, that the sufferings and death of Jesus might make a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. From the divine council in the creation to the sublime close of revelation, the Deity of the Son of God is manifest; and from the dread scenes in paradise, with the first dawn of hope to the fallen, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head," through all concurrent ages, to the agonies of the garden, and the death-pangs upon the cross, the humanity is clearly and unmistakably indicated.

"Nothing strikes or gratifies the intelligent Christian more than this fact: that the plan of salvation is exactly contrived to meet all the emergencies

and guard all the interests connected with man's redemption. He discovers that the act of pardon betrays no weakness; that it is not the result of a mere amiable attention to the miseries of the sinner, while other vital interests are forgotten. It is not a mere loose administration of clemency that may overlook the safeguards of executive authority, and allow crime to run riot in the universe. The heavy hand is not removed; sin is not treated as a trivial thing; the death-penalty is not, in a single instance, set aside. So deeply is this true, that even the Son of God himself, when he undertook to save man from his sins, could accomplish it only by dying in his place. No one who understands this great fact can ever doubt the fidelity of God to those immutable principles which must be inviolate in order to a perfect, or even safe, administration of government. If our faith in the ultimate justice and the ultimate truth, as they have their expression in the ultimate existence, could once be shaken, then there could remain for us no ground of faith whatever; or, if in the ultimate existence, which is God, there could be shown to be short-coming, and it could be demonstrated that truth and justice are not ultimate (that is, absolute) in him, then the last guarantee of good government would be swept away, and the last hope of intelligent creatures for safety, by means of an administration which should be an immutable protection against evil, must perish. Against this the atonement gives assurance. Even the Son of God, when he assumes our sin, must taste death. Not even he could stand in the sinner's place without touching the sinner's doom.

Then justice, in God, is ultimate, and the universe is safe. Right and wrong can never be confounded in the divine administration. God can 'be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.' Justice itself can justify the unjust through the intercession of the immaculate Sufferer. Sin may be pardoned in them for whom the Substitute died." (Bishop Marvin.)

But pardon, without a sacrifice, could make but a weak and obscure appeal to the heart or understanding; could not demonstrate the heinous nature of sin; could not manifest the loving favor of a gracious Father; and could not lead men either to hate sin as the greatest evil or to love God as the supreme Good. The guilt of sin lies in opposition to the authority of God, and in enmity and opposition to the purity and holiness of his character. This enmity and opposition to God must be removed from the heart, else pardon (if possible under such circumstances) would be useless. The gospel scheme presents means and agencies by which sin, in its guilt and in its depravity, may be removed. The death of Christ in the place of the sinner offers a reason that justifies the offended Lawgiver in dispensing mercy and granting forgiveness to the guilty. This scheme does not only remove our apprehensions as to the justice of the divine Lawgiver, but exalts him in our esteem as "the righteous Lord who loveth righteousness," who surrendered his beloved Son to suffering and death, that the influence of moral goodness might not be weakened in the hearts of his creatures—as a God of love, affording, in this instance, a view of the tenderness and benignity of

his nature infinitely more impressive and affecting than any abstract description could convey, or than any act of creating and providential power and grace could furnish, and therefore most suitable to subdue that enmity which had unnaturally grown up in the hearts of his creatures, and which, when corrupt, they so easily transfer from a law which restrains their inclination to the Lawgiver himself. If it be important to us to know the extent and reality of our danger, by the death of Christ it is displayed not in description, but in the most impressive action; if it be important that we should have assurance of the Divine placability toward us, it here received a demonstration incapable of greater certainty; if gratitude is the most powerful motive of future obedience, and one which renders command on the one part and active service on the other, "not grievous, but joyous," the recollection of such obligations as the "love of Christ" has laid us under is a perpetual spring to this energetic affection, and will be the means of raising it to a higher and more delightful activity forever. All that can most powerfully illustrate the united tenderness and awful majesty of God, and the odiousness of sin; all that can win back the heart of man to his Maker and Lord, and render future obedience a matter of affection and delight as well as duty; all that can extinguish the angry and malignant passions of man to man; all that can inspire a mutual benevolence, and dispose to a self-denying charity for the benefit of others; all that can arouse by hope, or tranquillize by faith—is to be found in the vicarious death of Christ, and the principles

and purposes for which it was endured." (Watson.)

For whom did Christ die? Does its benefits extend to all mankind? Was there any antecedent restriction, or primary decree, that excluded any part of the sinful race, irrespective of condition or character? Did Jesus taste death for every man? Did he die in the place and stead of every individual, as a sacrificial oblation, by which satisfaction is made for his sins, so that his sins may be remitted on the conditions of the evangelical covenant? Has any stern decree unconditionally consigned any man to perdition? With the Bible before us, there is no difficulty in answering all these questions. "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; who *will* have *all men to be saved*, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." If there were no other testimony, this would be sufficient to demonstrate the universal extent of the atonement, evincing the willingness of God to save all men, and the fact that Christ died for all. "He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." "That he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." "Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made

righteous." It is unnecessary to multiply quotations. There is no indication of a limited atonement taught in the Scriptures. The fact that all are redeemed does not prove that all will be saved. We may safely conclude that all who die in infancy are saved; and all who receive Jesus Christ, as the Saviour of sinners, by a personal faith, will be saved. But from whatever condition, from whatever age, from whatever land or nation the saved, the elect, are gathered, it is certain that they will all be saved through Jesus Christ, and will ascribe their salvation to him. "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion forever and ever."

If the atonement is universal, what are the benefits accruing to man? Life and immortality are brought to light by the gospel. "It is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." "And you hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins." "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast." "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and the forgiveness of sins." A godly sorrow is produced in the sinner's mind, when he looks upon him whom he has pierced. In the death of the Victim, he sees how hateful sin is in the sight of his loving Father; and with loathing he turns from the evil of his doings, smites upon his breast, and says, "God be merciful to me a sinner." He says, "What must I do to be saved?"

and the answer is explicit: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." No intervening rites and ceremonies—simple faith in Jesus Christ, the Sin-bearer, and the penitent believer is pardoned, is justified. In immediate connection with pardon, the remission of past sins, is the regeneration of the soul; the man is made a new creature by the direct agency of the Holy Ghost: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God;" and, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." Without this renovation pardon of past sins would avail nothing, because "the carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." This evil, depraved nature must be removed; the tree must be made good before the fruit can be good. However mysterious this change may be, yet a man may know it: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." "The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God."

In addition to these great blessings, provision was made through Jesus Christ for our sanctification. "For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself." "And you, that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable

and unreproveable in his sight: if ye continue in faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel." "That he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." "If we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." All of spiritual as well as of temporal good is through the mediation of Jesus Christ.

Upon what conditions and through what ageney is this salvation secured? Faith is the only condition of justification, and it is through faith that we are saved. We walk by faith and not by sight. Good works always result from faith. Where faith is perfect, unwavering good works—obedience—are the necessary sequence. Faith is the evidence of things not seen—the substance of things hoped for. So prominent is faith as a controlling force in the gospel scheme that it is referred to more frequently than any other proeess of the human mind. The efficient agency in applying the gospel to the human heart is the Holy Ghost. God said of the antediluvians: "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." Jesus told his disciples that he would send them the Comforter, the Holy Ghost: "And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth." He awakens, quickens, renews, sanctifies, and guides. So important a place does the Spirit of God hold in the redeeming scheme

that the sin against the Holy Ghost is unpardonable. "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption."

Men may "receive the grace of God in vain," and those may perish for whom Christ died. "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." If anyone fail of salvation, it is because of his neglect, indifference, unbelief, or malignant hostility to God's righteousness in Christ. If any man neglect this great salvation in this life, will it prove a final forfeiture? will not his case be opened in purgatory for a new hearing? No such idea is taught in the Scriptures. If the moral forces, employed in this life by Infinite Goodness, have proved ineffectual, does there exist in the universe other means by which the sinner can be touched? If the mission, teachings, sufferings, and death of Jesus Christ, attended by the active agency of the Holy Ghost, have failed to arrest the attention of the sinner, does there exist in the hands of Almighty Goodness more potent instrumentalities to accomplish the result? If the sinner, when his heart was tender, could go on in sin, and quench the Spirit, until he has become obdurate and insensible to guilt and shame, is it at all likely that there will be any change for the better? What will be given in exchange for his soul, when the redemption of the sinner ceaseth forever?

IS THE TRUST BETRAYED?

BY THE REV C. TAYLOR.

"We were allowed of God to be put in trust with the gospel."—1 Thess. ii. 4.

SUPPOSE the cholera to be prevailing throughout the country in which you live. Many have fallen victims to the terrible pestilence; many more have been attacked, and are suffering in the several stages of the disease. Various means—all that medical skill can suggest, or human ingenuity devise—have been employed to arrest its progress, and to heal those infected; but all in vain. The epidemic rages with unabated fury; the dead and the dying are everywhere around you; wailing and lamentation fill the air; the plague threatens to depopulate the country. By some strange providence a remedy has been put into your hands, with the declaration that it is a certain cure for this terrible malady. You yourself, having contracted the disorder, take this medicine and are restored; other members of your family, being similarly affected, follow the prescription and recover. Your neighbors are seized with the same violent symptoms; you give them this remedy, and they experience immediate relief. When it was made known to you, there was at the same time an injunction laid upon you to impart it to all

of whom you might hear as suffering with the disease. The same condition accompanies its bestowal upon every one who received it, and the supply in the hands of each is sufficient to meet all possible demands. In a short time nearly every family in the country is provided with this wonderful antidote. Intelligence comes to you that this dreadful scourge is prevailing with unprecedented violence in a distant city. The inhabitants have never heard of the restorative that has proved itself infallible in your section of the country. Hundreds are dying daily, with no alleviation of their sufferings; the entire population seems likely to be swept away. You have the medicine in sufficient quantity to administer to every case, with the certainty of cure; and remember, you were enjoined, as the condition of its gift to you, to impart it to all whom you might learn were diseased. What will you do? Will you excuse yourself by saying, "There are still some families here in my own country who are not yet supplied, and I must see that they have it before I send any abroad?" Or, will you not rather say, "Surely, I must make all haste to send this unfailing specific to those thousands who are suffering and perishing, with none to help. These few families in my own region who are not yet furnished have neighbors who are in possession of the same means of recovery, and it is far more likely that their necessities will be met than those of the multitudes in that plague-stricken city. I must, by all means, send it to those who most need it and who have it not." Thus you would reason, and you would act accordingly. You would not require urging to induce you to

discharge this obligation; you would do it with glad and eager haste, saying to yourself, "This medicine has saved my life and the lives of my family and friends, and I must as quickly as possible impart it to those thousands who are even now perishing for want of it." And you would esteem it a privilege of no ordinary magnitude that you were permitted to be the medium of restoring to health and friends such numbers of your distressed fellow-beings.

Sin is the disease—more fell and deadly than any malady that has ever infested humanity. Sin estranged man from his Maker, and transformed paradise into pandemonium. Sin closed the doors of heaven against us, and opened wide the gates of perdition. Sin obscured the effulgence of the divine favor, and brought instead the cloud of the Almighty's frown. Sin shut out from us the light of celestial day, and wrapped us in the gloom of a starless midnight. Sin effaced from the human soul the fair image of God, and impressed upon it the hideous likeness of Satan. Sin poisoned the sweet fountains of happiness in the heart, and poured into them the bitter ingredients of misery. Sin banished the bright angel of hope from the bowers of Eden, and brought in the grim demon of despair. Sin robbed our first parents of the priceless heritage of innocence, and substituted for it the terrible burden of conscious guilt. Sin bowed with shame that head that before was held erect in the knowledge of its uprightness, and mantled with confusion the face that had beamed with the assurance of perfect purity. Sin destroyed the spontaneous fertility of the earth in its yielding

of delicious fruits and nutritious grains, and gave it a pestilent productiveness of thorns and thistles, weeds and briers. Sin introduced the virus of disease and the seeds of death into bodies that otherwise had ever remained full of health and life immortal. Sin steals away the bloom from the cheek of childhood, weakens the strength of manhood, and brings on the decrepitude of tottering age. Sin lays our fairest flowers in the tomb, and sends us back with bleeding hearts to our darkened homes and desolate firesides. In its fearful march it sweeps away all our cherished joys, and its blighted track is strewn with the fragments of shattered hopes and broken hearts, miserable mementoes of its universal prevalence and resistless power. Sin has pointed the shafts of pain, kindled the fires of fever, and sharpened all the arrows of anguish that enter into the soul. Sin embitters all the streams of life, prostrates our bodies with sickness, emaciates our forms, causes every death, and digs every grave. Sin occasions the wails of bereavement that often rend the air, and makes every house, at some time or other, a Bochim—a place of weeping. Sin blasts our hopes, destroys our peace, ruins our youth, and fills the land with corruption and violence, lawlessness, rapine, and blood. Never was there a pestilence so destructive, a plague so deadly, an epidemic so wasting, wide-spread, and universal. No land, no clime, no age, no condition, is exempt from its all-pervading infection. This insatiate monster wields his remorseless scepter over every child of man, whether found beneath torrid suns or arctic snows, or in the milder zones between.

No wonder there comes up the plaintive cry, "Is there no balm in Gilead? is there no physician there?"

When the children of Israel had crossed the Red Sea, they traveled three days in the wilderness and found no water. Toil-worn, weary, and fainting from thirst, they at last come to a fountain, but find its waters so bitter that they cannot drink. They murmur against Moses, and he cries unto the Lord. The Lord shows him a tree, from which he takes a branch, casts it into the waters, and they become sweet. So God sent his Son—the "Branch" predicted by the prophets: "There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots." This "Branch," cast into the bitter waters of human existence, sweetens them for all time, and is an ample alleviation of all woe. The gospel makes known this Remedy for human malady and Satisfaction for human transgression as full, complete, and infallible. It brings health to the diseased, joy to the sorrowing, comfort to the mourning, and hope to the despairing. It imparts bread to the hungry, water to the thirsty, rest to the weary, riches to the poor, and relief to the distressed. It gives sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, speech to the dumb, strength to the feeble, courage to the timid, and encouragement to the desponding. It offers liberty to the captive, release to the prisoner, pardon to the guilty, cleansing to the polluted, a home to the outcast, and life to the dead. In providing an atonement for sin, it extracts from death its sting, robs the grave of its triumph, illumines the gloom of the sepulcher, and by its blessed light

points us to the shining shore of glory and immortality beyond.

Wonderful panacea! The glorious gospel! So wonderful, so glorious, that one might suppose it would be very scarce. No: it is abundant, as it is efficacious.

> Its streams the whole creation reach,
> So plenteous is the store—
> Enough for all, enough for each,
> Enough for evermore.

Surely, then, being so valuable, it must be very costly, so that only the rich can procure it. No; the invitation is: "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." "The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." Do all know of this gracious announcement? No, indeed. Three-fourths of your fellow-beings have never heard of it. They all need it as much as ever did you; it is as perfectly adapted to their want as it is to yours; it can do as much for them as it ever has done or can do for you. This gospel has come to you, and you have received its benefits; you live under its light; you possess it in the fullness of its provisions and blessings; you may have all the joys it can impart, and all the hopes it can inspire; you owe to it the security for life and property that you enjoy. All your social and civil, as well as religious, privileges result from the possession of the gospel.

The highest and best civilization is never reached without the gospel. Literature, science, and the arts attain their fullest development under the fostering influences of the gospel. All the nobler interests of humanity are most successfully promoted by the gospel. Above all, the longings of the race for a better life hereafter are satisfied only by the gospel.

But it has been given to you not to hoard up and enjoy alone by yourself. It has been committed to you, individually, as a TRUST. You are commanded by its Author to disseminate it to the remotest families of man, as well as to those around you. It is "good tidings of great joy to all people," and is designed for every other human being as well as for yourself. It possesses, also, this remarkable peculiarity—that you cannot possibly realize its highest blessedness in your own heart and life, unless you do all you can to communicate it to others. It enlarges and ennobles the soul that dispenses it. The converse of this proposition is also true. The soul that fails to impart it to others becomes narrowed and contracted from the influence of its own selfishness. The Christian growth of that soul is but dwarfed and feeble at best.

A tree can reach its fullest development only by extending its branches as widely as possible, and its capability for producing leaves is increased by every additional leaf that it puts forth; for each new leaf becomes a medium through which the elements in the atmosphere that go to nourish the tree are conveyed to its branches, trunk, and roots, and thus enables them to produce more. And thus, the

more the tree bears the more it grows, and the more it will bear. Where there are but few leaves given forth, there will be but little growth, and that sickly and stunted. "He which soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he which soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully." So with the true Christian. The more he imparts the blessed gospel to others, the more will he be nourished and strengthened by it himself. There is a beautiful philosophy as well as Bible truth in the statements: "There is that scattereth, and yet increaseth; and there is that withholdeth more than is meet, and it tendeth to poverty. The liberal soul shall be made fat: and he that watereth shall be watered also himself." "Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom." The rivers, ponds, lakes, and seas, give up their water in evaporation, but they get it all back again in the rains.

But even if there were no such reflex advantages as these, the obligation to communicate the gospel to those who have it not remains imperative upon you on the principles of common honesty. It is committed to you as A TRUST. We were "put *in trust* with the gospel." Can you withhold it from others without being guilty of a breach of trust. This is a very serious charge when made with regard to this world's goods. Suppose the property of minors is put into the hands of a trustee, to be used for their benefit and given to them when they need it. But instead of doing this, he keeps it all himself, and invests it for his own private advan-

tage. What does the law call his act, and how will the law treat him for it? Does the fact that the trust is "the true riches," instead of "unrighteous mammon," or that it is a divine injunction, instead of a human statute, change the nature of the offense? Does it not, indeed, greatly strengthen the obligation and increase the responsibility? and will it not aggravate the punishment?

But the apostle, in the text, speaks of this important trust as an exalted *privilege*. "We were *allowed* of God to be put in trust with the gospel." There is a sincere pleasure often experienced in being the bearers of relief to the needy, even when we act only as the almoners of others. It affords us such gratification to see how gladly and gratefully the benefactions are received, and what relief they impart, that we consider ourselves privileged in being permitted to confer the favors which others have intrusted to our hands for the purpose. So agreeable is this service, indeed, that it is often earnestly desired. This may be from the fact that the recipients of benefits regard the one through whom they are conveyed with nearly, if not quite, the same feeling of gratitude as they do the actual donors. If, then, to perform such an office in administering to the temporal necessities of your fellow-beings be regarded as a pleasing privilege, how much more highly should be esteemed the opportunity of giving or sending the bread of life which has fed your own famishing souls to those who are even now perishing for want of it? the medicine that has healed your spiritual maladies to the millions of the diseased who are dying daily without any knowl-

edge of its healing efficacy?—especially, when informed by the inspired word that it is intrusted to you for this express design.

Have you been—are you now—will you be—faithful to this trust?

"As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God." "Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful." "Give an account of thy stewardship!"

THE MERCY OF GOD IN CHRIST.

BY THE REV W. F. TAYLOR.

"For God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all."—Rom. xi. 32.

THE apostle founds his doctrinal system upon the sinfulness of the race. In his argument to the Romans he affirms that all are gone out of the way, and the entire world is guilty before God. In every aspect of human nature, and from every stand-point, this truth appears prominent, as the tallest summit rises above every lesser elevation. We read it in the numerous unequivocal declarations of the sacred word that all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; we read it in the testimony which each one's reason renders at the bar of conscience, together with the fact that with the very dawning of intellectual and moral life there have always been in every man the manifestations of an evil heart, and among the entire earth-teeming millions there has been no nation, nor even an individual, save the man Christ Jesus, upon whose life or character sin has left no stain. Let the inquirer after truth make these propositions the subject of honest, careful investigation, and he cannot fail to be convinced of the justice of the apostle's premise, that "both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh

after God." And by sin we do not mean merely the disorderly manifestations of the outward life, as these affect human government and society, but refer to a principle deep-seated in the heart, and cleaving to the very nature of man. That such is the character of sin is taught by our Saviour when he declares that men shall be judged in spiritual matters by their fruits. "Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit." From the fruit he directs our minds to the nature of the tree, and thus teaches us that in the outward conditions of human life we have an exhibition of the internal state of the human heart. He does not teach us simply that man is discouraged, and needs hope; that he is weak, and needs strength; that he is in darkness, and needs the light of truth—but that a foul disease has taken hold upon him, pervading his entire nature, and sending its poisonous influence through every artery and vein of his moral organism. It is only in this diseased moral nature that we are to look for the origin of whatever moral evils affect the life of man, and thus we appreciate the assertion of our Saviour that "out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, and blasphemies." And this was no new idea with Jesus; for the psalmist refers to the same truth when he confesses that he was shapen in iniquity, and conceived in sin. He had already, in the preceding verses, acknowledged his transgressions and his sins; but here he bewails the very internal principle of sin, the disposition in which these actual

transgressions had their origin; and so fully does he realize the dominion which it wields over him that he prays God to set him free from the thralldom by an absolutely new creation: "Create in me a clean heart, O God; and renew a right spirit within me." And so the apostle, when he says: "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." He does not say that it is *at* enmity, but that is *is* enmity against God; its very constitution, nature, essence, is enmity to God. It is inherently a principle of rebellion, and to it must be ascribed man's captivity to sin and death.

The word of God alone can furnish us an adequate solution of the inquiry whence originated this universal sinfulness of man; and whether, in relation to the soul, we accept the theory that humanity is not in each individual a separate creation, but only an evolution from principles of life formed in the beginning, or whether we hold that the soul is called into being by the direct agency of God, a perfect explanation is furnished of the whole career and present condition of the race; for whatever may be our philosophical theory, we cannot rid ourselves of the truth that, while every individual of the race has a personal relation to God's moral government, yet has God dealt with our humanity as a *whole*. In the original creation he so bound us together that whatever moral nature should characterize the first progenitor should likewise inhere in the entire body of his descendants. Not by accident, but in accordance with the divine purpose, mankind is so united that when humanity is cor-

rupted in the fountain the corruption flows on with the stream throughout the world's history. But for thus involving all men in the transgression of the first parent, the divine government has been frequently and most recklessly assailed. It is charged upon God as great injustice to make the probation of the whole race depend upon that of a single individual, and thus include all in the punishment of one. Infidelity has wickedly and persistently attacked the religion of the Bible at this point; and many persons have sought here a palliation for their own actual transgressions of the divine law, claiming exemption from its demands on the ground that its Author, and not themselves, was responsible for their inability to meet those demands. Even sincere and devout men have frequently been at a loss to understand the justice of thus connecting together the race in one general state of guilt. Accepting the fact because of its place in the divine record, they have been willing to leave the question of justice to the solution of eternity. But may we not vindicate the Deity as to this charge? We think we may; and in the vindication we shall perceive both an explanation of the present condition of our race and a most glorious manifestation of the Creator's love. What seems, at first view, a thorough refutation of this charge of injustice is often given in the assertion that we are not included in the *punishment*, but only in the *consequences* of Adam's sin. In support of this idea it is claimed that the Bible everywhere asserts, and with the greatest emphasis, that every man is *punished* solely on account of his *own* sin—as, "In those days they shall say no

more, The fathers have eaten a sour grape, and the children's teeth are set on edge. But every one shall die for his own iniquity: every man that eateth the sour grape, *his* teeth shall be set on edge." In connection with this we are referred to the fundamental principle of the judgment of the last day, that every one shall be rewarded or punished according to the deeds done in his own body. While this is true, however, it is agreed that the Scriptures fully recognize the fact that men suffer the *consequences* of others' sins, and that no one thinks of arraigning the justice of God for this peculiarity in the administration of his law. The profligate entail upon their children physical and mental disabilities as the result of their unrighteous lives, yet the justice and propriety of this are fully acknowledged, because these results ensue from the operation of the laws of our physical being; which laws, we are told, Moses referred to when he asserted that the iniquities of the fathers should be visited upon the children to the third and fourth generation. The children are not *punished for*, but are visited with, the *consequences* of the parents' sins. Just so, it is said, we suffer the consequences of Adam's transgression of the moral law of God. Entailing upon himself a corrupt moral nature in consequence of his sin, he imparted its corruptions to the race, by the same natural law which, from one generation to another, transmits the enfeebled mind or body of the parent upon the child.

Now, this may be all true in itself; but it does not reach the question in dispute. It teaches us that there is a natural law of transmission; but this

only prompts us to ask the question, Why is there such a law? It teaches us that all men are connected with Adam, and that by this relation they have degenerate moral natures; but why has God thus connected them? The theory proposed does not reach the difficulty of the subject. The reason is unsatisfied; it sees the earth under the original curse of God; it learns that sin is transmitted from one age to another; but, knowing that such would be the result, why has God thus bound in one the moral relations of us all?

A second proposition is that God has thus united the race for the *accomplishment of his own glory.* It is evident that both in our creation and redemption there is a reference to the divine glory; and, as this is secured by a manifestation of the infinite perfections, the plan of salvation based upon the fall of man furnishes an occasion for its highest exhibition. It may be that some of these perfections may never have been known but for the scheme of redemption; and surely without it they never could have been so clearly comprehended, nor could they have exerted such an elevating influence upon the race. Can we, however, be content with such a theory as this? are not the legitimate demands of reason unsatisfied with such an explanation?—an explanation which subjects men, to say the least, to the possibility of eternal damnation in order to secure the divine glory, or which purchases blessings for the race, and it may be for the universe at large, but in which many of us shall have no share. Why is it that, in a certain sense, *I* am to be sacrificed to the good of others, and my ruin is to be made the

occasion for the greater exaltation of my Creator? It may explain why sin was permitted to enter into the world, but it does not, and cannot, explain why we are connected with Adam; and we must provide a better vindication of the Godhead than that which shuts us up in sin and condemnation in order that he may be glorified.

We think there is a solution to the problem found in the nature and destiny of man himself, which, while it vindicates the divine justice, displays most gloriously the divine purpose to increase our happiness, and to magnify and exalt our glory. The apostle assumes that this relation of ours to Adam exists "*that God might have mercy upon all.*" With this statement before us—even allowing that, without any agency or connivance of our own, sin has entered into the world and corrupted every member of the human family—may we not safely assert that we are in a more favorable condition than if each soul had been a separate creation, wholly independent, and without any connection whatever with the father of the race? Has not this connection placed within our reach sublime possibilities and achievements to which, without it, we could never have attained?

This connection was necessary in order to *man's recovery from sin.* If each individual had been wholly independent of all others, each would have stood or fallen for himself; and in case he should have fallen, a restoration had been, so far as we can see, an absolute impossibility. From the very nature of the case, no one but the Son of God himself could have acted as Mediator between the offended Father

and his offending offspring. This we judge from the fact that the Son has offered himself in the stead of man. Had any less sacrifice been acceptable to the Father, Heaven had certainly never required this sacrifice of the Son. As God has but one Son, had the race been so created that each individual existed in a state of positive independency of all others, redemption had been provided but for one transgressor, while all others violating the divine law must have suffered eternally in hell. There is no escape from this conclusion, unless we have the Son of God making a sacrifice of himself in endless repetition; and this supposition is impossible, for the salvation of the soul requires his living, reigning presence in heaven, to apply the blessings which his sacrificial death has secured. By connecting the race under one head, however, it has been redeemed from sin by one general Head, acting for us as our Representative: "As in Adam all die, so in Christ all are made alive." The recovery is coëxtensive with the fall, and eternal life is secured to all who will accept it. It is assumed that the angels who kept not their first estate have been left without redemption, because they sinned against greater light and knowledge; but is it not more likely that they are still enduring the penalty of their sin, because each one was a separate creation, and the possibility of providing for each a separate Saviour was put beyond question? It appears to us far preferable that we are connected with Adam in a kind of "federal" relationship, and come into the world with a sinful nature, but with a willing and mighty Saviour ready to purify that nature, and restore us again to

the divine favor—to forgive us *time after time* if we violate the law of God, and to lift us up and place us *again and again* upon our feet if we fall into sin —than to be in the world, even with a nature which had never been corrupted, but with the divine law ever before us and announcing that the first violation of the same would produce a ruin from which there would be no possible hope of recovery. This view of the matter adopted, we have certainly a manifestation of mercy and love by which, instead of one, there are given us hundreds of possibilities for heaven and eternal life. As for ourselves, we prefer to have fallen when Adam fell, and to have inherited from him an evil nature, if we can live under a government which provides such glorious redemption for us, to being perfectly without stain or blemish, if we should have to discharge our individual probation.

Through our relation to the first we become connected with the Second Adam. This provides for us greater exaltation of *nature* than could have been possible as the result of our individual probation. "The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." By this very headship of Adam, the infinite has taken the finite into mysterious union with itself. The foundation has been laid for exchanging the earthy nature of the first for the heavenly nature of the Second Adam, by which the dignity and glory of our humanity are

infinitely exalted. Even the *body* of man is included in this provision for his exaltation. In the argument to the Corinthians, the apostle asserts that there is both a natural and a spiritual body; that the spiritual was not first, but the natural, and afterward that which is spiritual. This natural, or animal, body was that with which Adam was created. It was not given to man as the result of transgression, for the first man was formed of the dust of the ground, and the sentence of death pronounced upon his body was based upon its having retained its earthy nature. "*Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*" Here, then, we have a description of the body which man would forever have retained had the race not been bound together in its moral relations. Even though sin had never entered the world, and though there had been given us the same law of generation which now controls our physical nature, we could never have risen above this natural body; for "As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy." As the result, however, of our connection with Christ, we are to be endowed with spiritual bodies. What these spiritual bodies shall be, it is, perhaps, impossible for us to conceive, but we may rejoice in the assurance that the Lord Jesus Christ "shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." It will be a celestial body, and perfectly adapted to our heavenly state. It shall be raised in incorruption, in glory, and in power. Disease shall not affect it, fatigue shall not overcome it, death shall not destroy it; but, clothed with might and crowned with glory,

it will be invested, perhaps, with new faculties—while, in obeying the mandates of Jehovah, and in varying the sources of its own eternal pleasures, it will transport itself with the rapidity of light through the entire creation.

But the *spiritual nature* is also included in this exaltation. As true of the soul as of the body is it that we shall exchange the earthy nature of the first for the heavenly nature of the Second Adam. In the original creation man was, in his moral nature, formed in the likeness of God, which, according to the divine record, consisted in knowledge, in righteousness, and true holiness. If we hold that under Christ there is simply a reproduction of this divine image, we may consistently expect an increase of spiritual dignity and glory, on the ground of a more enlarged development of the elements which constitute this image. "No man hath seen God at any time;" but there is now a more satisfactory knowledge of the divine nature, since it is said, "He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father," and "the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." Human nature is capable of a more perfect righteousness by being brought into contact with the righteousness of Christ. We hold, however, that under Christ there is absolutely an impartation of the *divine nature*. Man has advanced in his relation from a creature to a child of God. So exalted is his state that, without irreverence, we may apply to him the words used of Jesus: "Being made so much better than the angels, he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. For unto which of the angels

said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father, and he shall be to me a Son?" Thus, endowed with the very nature of Deity, we are rendered capable of an infinite exaltation.

Even in our present state, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, and receiving the Spirit which he purchased with his blood, it is our privilege to advance almost indefinitely from one degree of glory to another; and when death shall be swallowed up in victory, when this corruption shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, the enlargement of the soul in all her faculties shall know no limit. Through all the cycles of eternity we shall approach nearer and nearer to the nature, the perfections, and the glory of the Godhead. The pure in heart shall not only see God, but, with the divine human nature ever expanding, they shall enjoy him as their minds never could have conceived, but for this mysterious union.

By our relation to Adam, and through him to Christ, there is provided for us also a better *inheritance* than could otherwise ever have been attained. The original inheritance was possession of the earth and dominion over every living thing; and without this relation, though sin had never entered into the world, we could only have inherited the possession and dominion bestowed upon the first progenitor of the race. The word of God teaches us that, through Christ, this inheritance is to be restored. "We, according to his promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." Not

only so, but in Christ our inheritance shall be vastly more extensive and more glorious. Our minds are lost in the contemplation of the immeasurable grandeur of being heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ. Heaven is not only secured to us, but we shall be the inheritors of *God's redemptive work and glory.* "He shall see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied," and when he who for the joy that was set before him endured the cross, despising its shame, shall gather his redeemed together, we shall sit down with him at the right hand of the throne of God, and partake of his own ineffable glory and dominion. The glory which thou gavest me, said Christ, I have given them, and from his exalted state he looks down upon man struggling with his spiritual foes, and encourages him with the assurance, "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne." Without this connection with Adam, and through him with Christ, we had inherited only the reward of our own lives and labors; whereas now we share the results of the life and labor of the Son of God—so far as we can know, the grandest and the most glorious ever achieved by Deity.

Our inheritance is also *enduring* in its nature. There shall be connected with it none of those elements of trial, doubt, and fear, which render it impossible for a probation, however favorable, to afford the highest degree of happiness. In itself it is incorruptible, undefiled, and fadeth not away. O the rapture of being in the immediate presence of God, of dwelling forever in the light of his joy, and in the radiance of his smiles, of drinking endless pleasures

from that fountain which is as satisfying as his own inexhaustible fullness, and as enduring as his own eternity!

If we be true to God, heaven is sure. By faith we may, even now, realize a vision of our future joy and glory. For us, even now, the celestial city is glittering.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT—ITS DURATION.

BY THE REV H. PEARCE WALKER.

"Lord, are there few that be saved?" Luke xiii. 23.

"Where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." Mark ix. 46.

THE above inquiry and its answer involve the question of the destiny of all men. Evidently, the interrogator did not believe that all men would be saved. That some of the race of man would be lost he could not deny. David had said (Ps. ix. 17): "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God;" and reason itself seemed to declare that the good and the bad could not consort in heaven. Hence he did not think it well to inquire whether all would be saved; but, "Are there few that be saved?"

Who this man was we know not, nor what his position or character. He may have been a self-righteous Pharisee; but it is more in keeping with the tenor of the whole account to suppose him one of the many followers of Jesus, who, up to this time, had not been sufficiently in earnest. Be this as it may, let it suffice to say that he does not appear to have been an idle *quidnunc*, nor an impertinent *quiz*. Jesus does not treat him as a trifler, nor upbraid him with irreverent curiosity. His question may have been idle, ill-timed; still, it shows no ordinary con-

cern about this momentous question of the state of the souls of men after death. Doubtless the concern he felt assumed a personal character. His question indicates surprise, mingled with pity, or sadness. This state of feeling resulted from the preaching of Jesus, whose standard of moral perfectibility raised the qualification for heavenly citizenship so high that it seemed impossible for the greater part of mankind to reach it. This was, to him, a new revelation, at which he was amazed and confounded. It reversed an opinion in favor of the greater part of the race, and raised doubts about his own safety. Such a tone of lofty sentiment he had never heard; an interpretation of the law so strict and searching was a thing altogether new and startling. Splendid visions faded in its presence, and dreams fondly cherished disappeared in its light. His soul must have been deeply agitated by conflicting emotions. Great billows of passion rolled across it, and surged and dashed violently on all the shores of thought, till from out this high-wrought feeling was born the question, "Lord, are there few that be saved?"

Here, then, was the time for Jesus, once for all, to settle a vexed question—if, indeed, it was a disputed question at that day—and we claim that he did it. Had this one been in error in supposing that some would be lost, Jesus was morally bound to enlighten him; but, instead of affirming that all men would be saved, his answer confirmed the view that orignated the question, by announcing the awful truth that many would seek to enter in at the strait gate, and would not be able. "The question is brought immediately by the Saviour out of the

region of abstract theory into the domain of pure *praxis.*" Strive, says he, agonize (*agonizesthe*), to enter in at the strait gate; for without this none shall be able. Their failure is not from the unwillingness of God, the insufficiency of the means, nor the hardness of the terms. It is their own fault; they alone are responsible. Some seek indifferently; others, too late. They improve not their opportunities; they trust in means inefficient; they do not *strive*, resolved to enter in at any cost. If, like leprous Naaman, they esteem Abana and Parphar better than the waters of Israel; if they worship at the shrine of imperfect reason, and make that the catechist and corrector of faith; if they reduce the religion of the Bible to a cold, lifeless formalism; if they make it consist in the observance of a few simple rites, the mere husks of a religious life; if they light their lamps at the altar of Christ, and provide no oil with which to replenish them; or, if they allow the cares of the world, the deceitfulness of riches, the pride of life, to "press beyond the limits of time the vast concerns of an immortal scene"—then, when the last sand is out, and the sound of the dreadful death-knell intones the passage of the soul to its God, self-accused and self-condemned, how, by what means, can they expect to obtain eternal life? The answer of Jesus shows that they will stand without, and knock, and cry, and plead for admission in vain. The door of mercy has closed upon them forever, and to all their fruitless cries moral and legal barriers, high as heaven, broad as eternity, deep as hell, interpose an eternal NEVER. The only response from within denotes an

eternal severance from God: "I know you not, whence you are. Depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity."

With the above explication of the text from Luke, we pass to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. If this be not true, there can be no future rewards nor punishments; and if this be true, then we think such a state necessitated by the difference in the lives and characters of those passing into eternity. But upon this point it is unnecessary to be exhaustive, because it is generally admitted by those who deny the future punishment of the ungodly. We advert to it more particularly for the purpose of keeping the chain of argument. This done, we shall proceed to the main point in hand.

Perhaps no question is fraught with so much interest as the destiny of men. Surely, to a being fated in a few fleeting years to close his eyes on all terrestrial scenes, and go to that "undiscovered country, from whose bourn no traveler returns," it should be the all-absorbing subject of concern; and it is precisely because this is the grand *finis* of revelation, the place where all its rays blend and burn in focal splendor, that the Bible is more highly prized than all other books, and that it has elicited more thought.

That the soul survives the wreck of the body—that it lives on in a state of conscious existence, and will continue to live forever—is a dogma of faith generally accepted by the Christian world, and one which comports well with the philosophy of life and the teaching of the Holy Scriptures. "The proof of this doctrine cannot be derived from any independ-

ent source; it can only be drawn from the word of God, and from the contemplation of life as a whole. Nevertheless, from the Christian stand-point, it is implied in special providence, in the eternal individuality of Christ and of the Holy Spirit, and in the appointments of religion, all of which find their true import in the idea of eternal destiny. But more particularly is this doctrine implied in the creation of man in the image of God; for all our ideas of immortality are traceable to the idea of the essential immortality of God. Hence, the fact that man was 'created in God's image, after his likeness,' contains the fundamental idea of his immortality; and, for this reason, the true conception of man regards him as the organ of revelation for the Godhead. The triune God can find no adequate form of revelation for himself, except in a kingdom of intelligent beings who are immortal. This was the proof of immortality given by Jesus to the Sadducees: 'God is not the God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him.' It is the destiny of all, whether righteous or unrighteous, which they cannot loose, to be vessels for the revelation of Godhead." (Marteusen.) "Whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's."

In some way this doctrine has impressed itself on the universal consciousness of mankind. It has become interwoven with the fiber of all creeds. How? We cannot tell, unless there be that in it which, on the mere statement, or suggestion, responds to the deep undertones of the soul, and makes all its cords

vibrate with sweetest music; nay, something that, like a fountain, rises up at the first and slightest touch, and suffuses the soul itself with a sunburst from heaven that makes every nerve tingle with sensations of pleasure. We are not much concerned about how it came into the consciousness of all, but we are impressed with the fact that it is there; and the wisest and best men among the heathen have borne testimony to that fact. Thus Cyrus, in his dying address to his children, says: "I cannot imagine that the soul, while it is in this mortal body, lives, and that, when it is separated from it, then it should die. I cannot persuade myself that the soul, by being separated from this body, which is devoid of sense, should thereupon become itself likewise devoid of sense. On the contrary, it seems to me more reasonable to believe that, when the mind is separated from the body, it should then become most of all sensible and intelligent." Cicero, after discoursing beautifully on this subject, adds the following: "Nobody shall ever drive me from the hope of immortality. If this, my opinion concerning the immortality of the soul, should at last prove an error, yet 't is a very delightful error, and I will never suffer myself to be undeceived in so pleasing an opinion." To these might be added the testimony of all the atomical philosophers, from Thales and Pythagoras down to Leucippus and Democritus, although the latter two finally founded their atheistical opinions on the atomical philosophy. The opinions of the Fathers, as to whether the soul is naturally immortal, vary according as they believed man to be a dichotomy or a trichotomy. All of them believed

in the immortality of the good; but some of them held, as Destructionists do now, that it is given as the reward of piety. Those who held this view denied the doctrine of eternal conscious punishment, and disposed of the wicked by annihilation. The advocates of this theory were few. It was never the doctrine of the Church, which always bore its testimony to a future state of rewards and punishments. Origen believed in the final restoration of all intelligent beings, even the devils;* but this was owing to his peculiar view of the transmigration of souls. Traces of the theory of emanation are discoverable in some of the fathers; but this was not calculated to disturb their belief in the soul's immortality, though it might be destructive of personal identity. The doctrines of creationism and traducianism were agitated at an early period, and were not without influence in shaping men's views of the soul's immortality. Most of those who denied its natural, or inherent, immortality believed that each particular soul is a separate and distinct creation by the Almighty; while those who affirmed that God originally made the soul immortal held that the souls of men are derived with their bodies *per traducem*. Mr. Richard Watson favored traducianism, but denied that the soul is naturally immortal. This is the stronghold of Destructionists, though Watson was not one himself. From this view we must dissent. We hold that God made the soul immortal; that the ground of its immortality is its proper and

* Recently it has been shown that Origen believed in an endless succession of restorations and declensions of the same beings.

essential spirituality. The denial of this involves the possibility of failing to reach immortality—consequently, the possibility of annihilation. For why should the Almighty make immortality an arbitrary law or endowment? If the essential basis, or *substratum*, of immortality lie not in spirituality, why should the existence of the wicked be perpetuated in a state of conscious suffering? why not make immortality, as well as bliss, the reward of piety, and, by a single stroke of divine justice, forever end the existence of those who recklessly throw it away? why lend immortality to the rebellious spirits cast down from heaven, and leave them to roam over the earth, tempting to ruin the souls of men? Immortality, as an essential attribute of spirit, is the only solution to these questions.

According to this view of man, time is necessarily connected with eternity; the present life is preparatory to the future, and man's condition there will be determined by his character here. Why should this life be so brief, and that so long, unless it be to afford us the opportunity of becoming qualified and worthy to enter upon that glorious life that knows no ending? This is the true significance of our present state of trial and discipline. Had we needed no preparation for the life to come we should have been placed in the midst of it from the beginning.

We accept as the law of our being the fact, confirmed by experience, that no boon is given which we are not required to utilize by striving. Even our natural life, the world in which we live, with all its materials ready for the designing mind and the molding hand, would become a curse instead of

a blessing, unless effort be made to adapt them to our wants. There are ships in the dense forests of oak and teak, costly houses and beautiful statuary in immense quarries of granite and marble, precious metals in dark and dangerous mines, and treasures in the mighty deep; but how much labor and ingenuity must be put forth before they can be made subservient to our purposes! And, if the future life of blessedness were less than the sum of all our moral energies coöperating with the grace of God, it would not only be the least, but the least appreciable, of all his gracious gifts. It would be an anomaly in the universe, without analogy—a violent break in the unity of the divine plan and purpose. How many resist successfully to the end of life the plan and purpose of the Almighty! Their moral powers are employed in overcoming the grace of God and perverting the sense of justice. How can these ever attain unto life eternal?

That man is a responsible being is scarcely a debatable question. What, but this, mean *understanding*, *free-will*, *sensibilities*, and a *divine rule of action?* Furnished with the power, means, and opportunity of knowing, feeling, and acting in accordance with the divine law of life, man becomes the arbiter of his own destiny; and what can the Almighty do to such a being but ratify his choice and secure to him the possession of what he freely chose? It is a part of the original grant, that cannot be canceled, that man shall have what he lives for; and no power in the universe shall deprive him of it. It may be delayed; it may not always be granted in this life, owing to the disorder and imperfection reigning

here; but the life to come will be marked by a just balance, and then the earnings of this life will be given, the workmen paid off, each receiving what he labored to obtain: then the crop that was sown here shall be reaped and the reaper receive his reward. "Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap."

But the question that we are directly concerned with now is the fact of future punishment—its nature and duration. Here we are met by two systems of theology, by two classes of religious teachers. One of these teaches the salvation of all men; the other affirms that, according to the teaching of the Scriptures, the wicked, dying impenitent, will be lost or condemned to suffer eternal punishment. The one brings forward the *apocatastasis panton*, the universal restoration of things, as an infallible expectation; the other holds that the affairs of this world close in a dualism, dark on the one side, light on the other; that the condemnation of the wicked will be to eternal conscious punishment; that no period of release from the curse will ever come.

In arguing this question, Universalists hold that the loss of a soul is contrary to the purpose, opposed to the will, and at variance with the character, of God; that it sets bounds to the work of Christ, and limits the efficacy of his death; that it represents him as partial to some, toward others vindictive and harsh; that it is repugnant to reason and contrary to the teachings of the Bible; that it leaves the problem of moral evil unsolved—leaves it to exist forever, an unconquered foe to God and good. Were these representations true, ill would it fare

with orthodoxy; for that asserts the reverse of it all —truly, a wide divergence of belief.

It shall be our task to disprove these assumptions, as being without warrant in fact, reason in philosophy, analogy in nature, or proof in the word of God: without warrant in fact, for the rich man lifted up his eyes in hell, and his state is described as unchangeable; without reason in philosophy, for that shows that the state of men should ordinarily be conformable to their character; without analogy in nature, for there every thing is assorted after its kind and element; without proof in the word of God, for that declares "the soul that sinneth it shall die;" "the wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." This is short work, but true.

So far as Universalism is concerned, the term salvation is a misnomer; for there is no personal devil to tempt men, no hell for them to suffer in, and no sin for them to be saved from. They hold that God has unchangeably foreördained whatsoever comes to pass, even the worst acts of the worst men. In this respect they agree with Calvinists. But if the Bible is to be believed, sin is so utterly at variance with the nature and will of God that it is impossible for him to decree its existence. Its foreördainment would change or destroy its nature. It would then be something else—the opposite of sin; or else God himself would be something else—the opposite of holiness. If, then, there is neither sin, Satan, nor hell, there is nothing to be saved from, unless it be from God's decrees. This, and not orthodoxy, turns the work of Christ into a farce, a melodrama, and

himself into a stage-actor. What could more effectually limit the office and work of the Redeemer? If God decreed sin, and Christ saves men from it, does he not go against the purpose of God? Or, can the Almighty decree sin as sin, and then decree that Christ should save men from his decrees? This represents him as having two wills, and two sets of decrees directly opposed. This is the God, and this the only salvation, of Universalism.

It is strange how Universalism and Calvinism have a common root in predestination. Both start from this. But how soon they diverge! Universalism teaches that God predestined *all* men to eternal life, while Calvinism teaches that, "by the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreördained to everlasting death." Universalism and Calvinism both teach that all whom Christ died to redeem will be saved; but the one says he died to redeem all; the other says he died to redeem only a part—a "number so fixed and definite that it can be neither increased nor diminished." We regard both these systems as dangerous to the souls of men; but certainly, viewed in reference to the character of God, as *holy*, *just*, and *good*, Universalism has the advantage. Teach men that "God, from all eternity, did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass," and you paralyze their moral powers in the direction of doing good, and furnish them with a ready excuse for their sins, as necessitated by the Divine decrees, and therefore not preventable. Under such conditions, the act is

no more the creature's than the killing of a man is the act of the fall, when impelled by a force set free behind it, and sent on its mission by the intention of an intelligent agent; and so the creature cannot, in justice, be held responsible for deeds and volitions which crop out in him as the fruit or fulfillment of the preördained purpose of an all-wise and omnipotent God, or as the predetermined and fixed results of a will seored and fretted by the unfailing deerees of Heaven, projected upon it from a past eternity. To a few, somehow better constituted, these doetrines may not be seriously hurtful, just as some persons, from eauses unknown, can go through the scourge of eholera; but to the greater part of mankind, whose love of sensual indulgence, and strong bias to worldly sinfulness, puts them in search of exeuses to justify their ungodly living, we must regard them as having the effect to induce a state of supine indifference to their lives, and manifest unconcern for their souls.

It is evident that Universalists have no salvation from penalty; for they hold that no suffering is penal, but that all suffering is eorrective. One cannot be saved from what he was never exposed to, nor ean one be saved from what he aetually endures. Universalists hold, and we think eorrectly, that certain bad consequenees of sin are inevitable. This, however, is the only penalty they know, and it is endured in this life in full tale. Hence, there is no pardon and no salvation; eonsequently, if saved at all, we are not saved by grace, but by justice. But the end is not yet; for the denial of salvation from penalty vitiates the doetrine of salvation from sin,

and reduces Universalism to a heap of contradictions. Punishment does not save from sins already committed; and then there still remains the bad effects of sin in the mental and moral habitude. Facts prove that punishment is not a panacea or a prophylactic for sin. On many it has a hardening instead of a subduing power. We have known men to grow worse and worse under suffering, till death put an end to their miserable existence. They have been known to die, after months or years of extreme sufferings, blaspheming God. In such cases, Universalists will have to invent a second installment of suffering after death, to produce reformation and fit them for heaven, ere they can make out a case of universal salvation. But there is no proof of such reformatory effort in the world to come; and if there were, it is by no means certain that it would have an effect different from what it had here; for we have already noted the tendency of suffering, in numberless cases, to harden. And who is prepared to prove that this hardening process may not go on as long as the soul of the sinner exists, or until reformation is no longer possible? Then, if the soul be immortal, it must suffer forever. What the nature of these sufferings may be is another question; but we hold that any soul eternally divorced from God, its only source of happiness, must, of necessity, be miserable.

"To what purpose are all the pangs and sorrows of which the world is full? Are they all vindictive, or reformatory? Neither wholly the one nor the other. They are the results of a natural system of penalty, no less just than wise and merciful, which

is exemplified on a large scale in the nervous system. The nerves of sensation, so exquisitely susceptible of pain, are designed by the skillful Artificer to protect from bodily harm, by the infliction of penal suffering for the infraction of nature's laws. But do we find men generally careful to observe these laws, and avoid suffering? How often do we see them driving on against dangers of which they are daily admonished, till they make a complete sacrifice of health or life! In the general economy, their pains were salutary and healing; but, in their cases, they have killed—teaching us that they who disregard the lessons of penalty perish under it, and by it. May we not conclude that, throughout all the government of God, persistent infraction of divine law tends to deteriorate and destroy? And so, too, the gospel is a savor of life unto life, or of death unto death, according as it is used or disused."

The same great law that, like gravitation, extends everywhere is seen in the action of conscience as applying to man's moral nature. If its admonitions be disregarded, it becomes blunted. Persisting in wrong-doing, its misgivings die out; regret gives way to hard-hearted indifference, and the distinctions in moral actions become confused and obliterated. The whole doctrine of judicial blindness, and of consignment to a lie, set forth in the Scriptures, seems to be a verification of this law.

And may we not inquire, What reformatory effect did the drowning of the old world have? the burning of the cities of the plain? the sufferings and deaths of pious martyrs, and of millions of innocent

infants and children? Yet the author of "Pro and Con" affirms that, "if sufferings are not reformative, they are useless; for they cannot repair the injuries done by the offender, and they cannot keep others from committing the same offense." Had he thought seriously on the magnitude of the evil of sin, and on its proper deserts, he would not have rejected the doctrine of the penal nature of suffering. But just here is one of the radical errors of Universalism. It is unused to grapple with sin as the monstrous foe of God and man; it has not thought deeply, earnestly, on the almost infinite magnitude of moral evil—hence it has no idea of its infinite desert. Holding that all things were foreördained of God—all the desires and actions of men before they were born; all the murders, robberies, frauds, and falsehoods; the cruelty, oppression, and corruption; all the evils that fill the earth with unrest and wretchedness—they come to look upon them as a necessary part of the Divine economy, in order to a greater good. Men are not responsible—they could not have done otherwise. Sin, if any thing less than good disguised, is the misfortune of our race, not its crime, and the sinner is no criminal. The vilest character that ever lived did the will of God as fully as the best. Hence sin is a very small, a light and insignificant, thing. How cruel and malevolent is God to inflict all these evils on humanity without any fault or choice of our own! Orthodox Christianity represents all suffering, in this life and in the life to come, as the natural result of wrong-doing, as the inevitable consequence of sin, deliberately chosen by the sinner, against warning,

against reason and revelation, against the gracious influences of the Holy Spirit. The result—fixed, irrevocable, and necessary—is accepted with the choice. Which represents the Almighty as the God of love and justice?

Once more, before leaving this point: If suffering be reformatory, why are not the worst sinners the greatest sufferers? This point was a mystery to Asaph till he went to the house of God and learned to account for it on the principle of future rewards and punishments. Again, if God foreördained sin to work out a greater good, why did he not give the better class of men an equal chance with the worse class? Surely he is not partial to the wicked.

It is no inconsiderable objection to Universalism that it blots out all the distinctions between virtue and vice, unless it be to exalt vice over virtue. It destroys all the motives to a life of godliness. All the advantages, prospectively, are on the side of sin —the more sin the greater good. To this end was it foreördained. According to this doctrine, Nero will have a brighter crown and a higher reward than Paul; in the race for immortal honors Judas outstripped the other apostles, and will be first in the kingdom of heaven. Such doctrine is shocking to the moral sense of justice; yet it is true, or Universalism is false. And if all men believed it, it would turn this world into a hell worse than any that ever entered the brain of the most extravagant orthodox.

The method relied on to support the doctrine of Universalism is defective. Aside from a few discon-

nected and disjointed passages of Scripture, they rely, mainly, on the *a priori* method, from some of the attributes of God. We do not object to the *a priori* mode of reasoning, but to their utter want of regard to symmetry and coaction in the divine perfections. They construct their argument not on the whole of the perfections of God, as they are revealed to us in Scripture, but merely on *goodness*, *wisdom*, and *power*. Thus justice is wholly left out. This makes the argument one-sided, worthless, fallacious. With the arguments drawn from life and facts, from a due harmonizing of the divine attributes, and from a proper regard to the rules of sound exegesis, and of the interpretation of Scripture by Scripture, they have little to do, because it is but too plain that these conduct to the dark goal of retribution. Their method is extensive rather than intensive. They have enlarged the divine benevolence at the expense of divine justice, till they have made it embrace, in the final issue, the whole family of man without regard to character. This method seems to deal lightly with eternal life as an infinite boon; it stands in the way of every one, as a matter of course—a possession which can neither be won nor lost. Consequently, there is nothing to stimulate the moral powers, nothing to call forth moral energies and raise the soul out of the sloughs of sin. Life is not a race, with the prize at the end for the faithful runner, and shame for the lazy lounger-by-the-way; nor a warfare, with a crown for him that overcometh; but simply a state of nonage, in which nothing is at stake, and nothing demanded or expected. Had the authors of the books comprising

the Bible understood this, they would have given us a different Scripture.

The flaw in the argument, based on the attributes *wisdom*, *goodness*, and *power*, is seen in the fact that it takes no notice of God's justice, and presents a wholly one-sided view of his character. Hence the argument is fallacious, and the system built upon it false. If the Scriptures tell us "God is love," they also tell us "He is a consuming fire;" "Just and righteous is he."

We are told that the wisdom of God was sufficient to devise means for the salvation of all; that his goodness would prompt him to do it; and that his power is sufficient to carry the means into effect: from which it follows that he would and did devise the means, and will put them into effective operation, so as, infallibly, to save all men. Deny the first, and you limit his wisdom; deny the second, and you limit his goodness; deny the third, and you limit his power: but, as you cannot limit the attributes of God, it follows that all men will be saved.

To test the validity of this argument, let us substitute justice for goodness. The argument will be as valid with goodness left out as it is with justice left out. Accepting, then, the Bible-teaching that all men are sinners, we take the three attributes *wisdom*, *justice*, and *power*, and proceed to throw the argument into the same form as the other. The wisdom of God was sufficient to devise means for the damnation of all men: his justice would prompt him to do it, and his power is sufficient to carry these means into effect. Hence it follows that he

would and did devise the means, and will put them into effective operation, so as, infallibly, to damn all men. Deny the first, and you limit his wisdom; deny the second, and you limit his justice; deny the third, and you limit his power: but, as you cannot limit the attributes of God, it follows that all men will be damned. What now? Universal damnation? It is proven as clearly as universal salvation, and by the same argument, from the attributes of God. The fact is, both arguments are fallacious and their conclusions false; both are one-sided and have no regard to the necessity of harmonizing the demands of justice and mercy. By the same argument you could prove that God never could have allowed sin, and death, and woe to enter our world. But, notwithstanding God is infinite in wisdom, goodness, and power, these evils do exist. There must, then, be some way of harmonizing this sad state of things here with these attributes; and if sin and suffering may and do exist here without necessitating the impeachment or the denial of these attributes of God, they may exist in the after-life without involving these consequences.

That God could and would devise, and has devised, sufficient means for the salvation of the whole family of man is a main point in Arminian theology—a doctrine that we heartily indorse and strongly insist on; but that the salvation of man is simply a question of divine potency we deny. True, salvation can be effected and completed by the power of God only; but the exercise of this power he himself has limited by, and conditioned upon, the will of the creature. A preparatory work must take place in

man before the divine power can be put forth in pardon, renewal, sanctification, and eternal glorification. This preparatory work is partly of the creature, partly of God. Enlightening, calling, quickening, belong to God; repenting, choosing, believing, belong to man. Without the first, man cannot repent and believe; without the second, God cannot pardon and regenerate. Man and God coöperate. Moral forces are united and blended. Man must work out his salvation with fear and trembling, because God works in him to will and to do—that is, to enable him to will and to do. Enlightening, calling, quickening, do not make repenting, choosing, and believing indefectible, but possible. They do not annihilate man's free moral agency; they only make it complete. They do not infallibly superinduce repentance and faith; they only make it possible for man to repent and believe, and stimulate his moral powers to do so by supplying him with sufficient motives. Notwithstanding these, man is still free, having power to reject the means of life, the tender of salvation, by remaining impenitent and unbelieving. He yet retains power to stifle and crush out the incipient life divine put within his soul; his ruthless hand may yet erase all the fructifying impression of the Spirit, choke the good seed of the kingdom in its birth; and he may thus madly, blindly, wickedly sin against the light and knowledge, the graces and influences, of Heaven, and heedlessly, guiltily, inexcusably rush on in his headlong career of self-ruin, trampling beneath his feet all the hallowed mercies of God, until his fate is forever sealed in hell.

Universalists tell us that eternal punishment is incompatible with divine love. It is true that some who accept the doctrine as scriptural, professing to be unable to reeoncile it with the teleology of divine love, have claimed the diseovery of an "antinomy in the Scriptures, as well as in Christian thought—that is, an apparent eontradietion between two laws equally divine, which it seems eannot find a perfectly conelusive and satisfactory solution in the present stage, the earthly limits, of human knowledge." Hence they leave this antinomy as a "*crux* of thought which never ean be solved by the Church militant, or from her point of view"—not that there is no solution of it, but either that solution has not been given, or, if it has, we are unable to find it. Yet, however, they admit that, while no solution has been found in theory, praetieally it is found in Christian conseiousness which feels that it is still in eonflict. But it must be remembered that the authors of this view are predestinarian; and we hold that, on this hypothesis, no reeoneiliation *can* be found between divine love and eternal punishment. They stand the poles apart—wholly, completely, eternally antipodal. We elaim that, if any such antinomy exists, the solution is found in the inexcusable nature and infinite evil of sin, the freedom of man, the sovereignty of the *will* over human aetions, and eonsequent responsibility. To us it seems no more inconsistent with divine love that the wicked should be punished after death than are the sufferings of God's creatures in this world, espeeially the innoeent. Had we no knowledge of this fact from observation and experience, it would be quite as

hard to believe, and equally as irreconcilable with the love of God. And as the existence of suffering here has resulted in a method of reconciliation, we may reasonably conclude that whatever difficulties we now have on the subject will vanish in the light of eternity.

The great error of Universalists, at this point, consists in treating the love of God as a mere creaturely affection, instead of that exalted sentiment that has respect to the character of the creature. If he love the creature merely as a creature, then, indeed, is the suffering of that creature, either in this world or in the world to come, wholly irreconcilable with his love, even in the view of a greater good; because we cannot suppose the Almighty limited to this one means of working out the greatest degree of good which the creature is capable of receiving and enjoying; and we must believe that he would select that means which he knew and felt to be more in keeping with the perfections of his Being. But if the love of God to the creature have respect to character, or to powers and qualities constituting a capacity for good, which may enable the creature to fulfill the high destiny for which he was made, and then that which makes the creature an object of God's love be destroyed by the voluntary choice and living of that creature, why should—nay, how can—it continue to be the object of divine love? The free exercise of the powers with which it was endowed, directed in the wrong channel and kept there, have perverted its whole being and thwarted the design for which it was made. Then, as a decayed branch, whose powers even of restoration

being gone, can no longer be fruitful, it is lopped off and burned; and as a mortified limb, which has no more any power of life and can only prove hurtful to the body, it is cut off and sunk into the abyss of things that might have been but never were.

And just here we think we can see how the love, no less than the justice, of God may demand the eternal condemnation of the sinner. First, that sin may receive its desert; and, secondly, for the safety and security of the body. "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump." A mortified limb, if not severed, brings death to the whole body. Sin is that leaven—that mortified member. It is a moral contagion, breathing pestilence and death; it is essentially diffusive and corrupting. To reward vice, is to give it license; to let all offenders go free, is to demoralize and disrupt society—nay, to subvert the foundations of government and bring law and order into contempt. The Almighty stands pledged to truth, to law, order, government. He is pledged to secure the righteous in the possession of eternal life—to make heaven a place of peace, and safety, and blessedness. Hence the love of God for the good, for those in whom is his own image, who are capable of glorifying him throughout the ages of eternity, demands their security by the banishment of the wicked, and by such an expression of God's hatred of sin, of its disorganizing and ruinous nature, visited upon them, as shall forever memorize its folly as well as limit its influence.

The argument brought forward against an eternal hell—that it is incongruous with the sovereignty of God, who will never triumph over moral evil, never

bring forth the design of creation to perfection, and consequently will be defeated in his purpose of bringing all men to glory—is thus cogently met by Delitsch: "There needs no final abolition of hell that the whole creation may be a copy, or expression, of the everlasting triumph of light over darkness. This triumph is completed. If the whole creation were one being, it would indeed have to be perfected in such a manner as that the darkness in this one nature should be abolished in light. But as the entire creation is an infinite number of beings, that triumph is then already perfected when those beings, which have taken their stand in the principle of wrath, are capable of nothing further in opposition to the Holy One, whose hereditary portion is in light, and which have become the footstool of God and his Christ—*i. e.*, the dark ground on which is enhanced the glory of the divine dominion. God is thus, moreover, *panta en pasin*, all in all. He, who in respect of his triune nature is love, embraces all who have laid themselves open to this love with the light of his *doxa;* and all who have shut their hearts to this he encircles with the darkness and fire of his *doxa.* Love has conquered; evil is placed under bonds. There needs not its absolute annihilation that the hexahemeron of the world's history may close, as did that of the world's creation, with a very good."

The argument from the purpose of God to save all is void, because it assumes that purpose to be unconditional. Of this there is no proof. Bishop Martensen says, truly: "This is a purpose conditioned by the free-will of man and its development

in time; hence it can only he held, consistently, so as to quadrate with the possibility of eternal damnation." The Scriptures represent the purpose of God as having respect to the will and life of the creature, and as determined by them. Essential to salvation is the concurrence of the human and divine purposes. This consent and coaction of the human will cannot be had coercively; and if it could, the price paid would be the loss of moral excellence. For we hold there can be no moral excellence without character, and character depends on intelligence and moral freedom. God's purpose to provide salvation for all was unconditional; his purpose to confer salvation was and is conditioned on repentance toward God and faith toward the Lord Jesus Christ. "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him."

We now propose an *a priori* argument, based on the admitted fact that God is essentially, absolutely, eternally, and unchangeably good. He is not merely good, but essentially good—good not in a dependent, relative, or comparative sense, but in the absolute sense; not good for a time, or in favorable circumstances, but always, forever, and unchangeably. He is not only good, but Goodness itself. This is the ground relied on by the advocates of universal salvation, and which we have already adverted to; but it is a point of so much importance in this controversy that we propose to give it a more extended notice, and, by the method which they themselves adopt to storm this stronghold, wrest it from their

possession, and show that the goodness of God, in the case of the finally impenitent, demands the very opposite of what they teach.

If, then, God is essentially, absolutely, eternally, and unchangeably good, it follows that he cannot do wrong, or, in any sense whatsoever, instigate or approve of wrong-doing in any of his creatures. All his powers have ever been, must and will be forever and unchangeably, employed in discouraging and opposing wrong, and in doing, promoting, and encouraging good. It must be as impossible for him to be indifferent to sin in his creatures, or not to be displeased with it, as it is for him to do wrong himself. Consequently he cannot decree, foreördain, induce, tempt, or in any way directly or indirectly cause or influence, his creatures to do wrong—to do any thing contrary to the principles of his essential goodness and holiness. Sin is a thing so utterly, essentially—yea, even radically—repugnant to God, so abhorrent to his nature, that he must, necessarily, be opposed to it. This being true, and it being also true that God is immutable, it follows that it will be impossible for him ever to regard it differently from what he does now; for he is just as good, and holy, and unchangeable at any one time as he ever will be; consequently he can have no views or feelings toward sin in the future that he has not always had; for "with him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." Therefore, if he ever did look on it with displeasure, he ever must look on it with the same feeling; if he ever did hate it, he must continue to do so forever; if he ever did punish it, he must punish it eternally, provided it exists eter-

nally. Now, we know, from the Scriptures, that God has been and is displeased with, and inveterately opposed to, sin; that he hates iniquity and transgression; and that he has punished sin in the person of the sinner. We know that the soul is immortal—will never die. We know that some men die in their sins, without repentance, having "no bands in their death," sometimes blaspheming God, their hearts obdurate, their consciences dead, "seared as with a hot iron." Hence we cannot avoid the conclusion that, as God's goodness is, and must forever be, opposed to sin, and as he has punished it in time (Universalists admit this), and as some men die in their sins, which thereby become eternally fixed in the immortality of their souls, that same goodness must continue, forever, to be displeased with it, and to punish it.

Again, nothing can be clearer than that the goodness of God requires him to love virtue and to hate vice. Hence he must, in some appropriate way, show the state of his feelings toward them. Without this he would encourage both alike, or neither. But it would be contrary to his goodness to encourage vice, or not to encourage virtue. To encourage virtue properly, he must be good; to encourage vice, he could not be good, but must be evil; to encourage neither, he must be indifferent to both. But this is absurd, because goodness cannot be indifferent to virtue without being indifferent to itself; neither can it be at one with vice and not be itself evil. Wherefore we conclude that, as God must necessarily manifest the state of his feelings toward virtue and vice, and as he has done so, and as the

only way in which this can be done is by rewarding the one and by punishing the other, and as the sinner dying in his sins will continue in them forever, and as God is unchangeable and can never love sin, and as virtue cannot receive its appropriate reward nor vice its proportionate penalty here, there will be—nay, the goodness of God demands—a future state in which these awards will take place; and as that state will be an eternal one, the good will be eternally blessed, and the wicked must be eternally punished. Only by the infliction of eternal punishment can God make known the infinite evil of sin and his infinite hatred of it.

The distinctions in virtue and vice are not arbitrary; they are not created by law—they constitute the foundation of law, and are the reasons for its existence. The principles on which these distinctions rest are essential elements of the divine nature, and therefore immutable and eternal, always and everywhere the same. And it is because they are grounded in and from the substratum of the divine nature that the Almighty cannot ignore or set them aside without denying himself. Hence it follows that God must be—in order to be true to himself, in order to maintain law, order, government, and promote virtue, happiness, and peace—the eternal, unalterable friend of virtue and foe of vice; and as such he must forever reward the one and punish the other.

But we turn to the arguments from Scripture, and from the meaning of certain words employed by the sacred authors to designate the duration of the future state, both of the righteous and the unright-

eous. These words are the noun *aion*, the adjective *aionios*, both Greek, and the Hebrew word *holam*, or, rather, *olam*. The primary proper meaning of these words is, undoubtedly, expressive of unlimited duration. Of late an attempt has been made to break the force of this argument by rendering these words *age*, and *age-lasting;* that is, as denoting an indefinite or limited time. To support this view, the derivation of *aion* has been sought in some word that excludes the idea of eternity. Thus, a Unitarian writer carries the word back to *aiones*, *eons*, and as these were supposed to be spiritual beings, it was claimed that *aionios* means spiritual, and not eternal. Cremer, a distinguished German critic, announced, a few years since, that *aion* was from a Sanskrit verb signifying "to breathe." From this come *life*, *time of life*, *generation*, *indefinite period*, etc. This view was too hastily adopted by Dr. Edward Beecher, among others of less note; for he had scarcely sent forth to the world this adopted theory, when he "is informed that the great scholar, whom he followed, had given up his Sanskrit etymology of *aion*, and had adopted that of Aristotle, and that the lexicographers and critics who had followed him into the Sanskrit had followed him out of it, and therefore Dr. Beecher himself had the unpleasant task to perform of falling in with the retreating procession. Still he does not agree to the sense given by Aristotle (ever-existing), which he says was introduced into the Greek language five centuries after the death of Homer, for which reason it may be regarded as a new philosophical word."*

*Dr. Enoch Pond.

Following Cremer into the Sanskrit, Dr. Beecher says the word means "something pertaining to an age, or the world to come, without any reference to duration," and he seeks to bolster up this tottering theory by appealing to Prof. Taylor Lewis, who, he says, develops the use of the *olamic*, *aionian* life, and is supported by the venerable Peshito, which, he says, uniformly renders *zoe aionios* eternal life, the life of the *olam*—that is, the life of the world to come. But does not Dr. Beecher know that *olam*, with the Hebrews, meant definitely *eternal*, *forever?* that this is its uniform rendering? and that out of three hundred and eight occurrences of the word in the Old Testament it is translated in the Septuagint by *aion* and its cognates in all but twenty instances? It is conclusive, therefore, that the expression, "the life of the *olam*, or world to come," which Dr. Beecher contends for, is equivalent to the phrase "eternal life," for the Hebrews always understood the life of the *olam* to be *everlasting;* and so the LXX. understood it and translated it by its proper Greek equivalent. The notion that *aion* comes from *aio*, which Dr. Beecher says means *to breathe*, is purely fanciful, since the word means properly "*to hear*," "*to see*," "*to perceive*." Dr. Enoch Pond says: "In the ancient classics it is used but once in the sense of 'to breathe,' and that even is put down as a doubtful rendering."*

Dr. Beecher's own admission is fatal to his position. He says: "This philosophical sense of *aion*, 'the sense of eternity,' was introduced into the Alexandrine Greek, through the writings of Plato and

* So Liddell and Scott.

Aristotle." Further: "The derivation of Aristotle has been through the rounds of lexicons and controversies as absolutely decisive." It was, then, through Plato and Aristotle that these words, *aion*, etc., came into the Greek of Alexandria, into the Septuagint, and thence into the New Testament, in the sense of *eternity*, *eternal*, *everlasting*, *forever*. Whatever may have been the meaning of *aion* in the time of Homer, five hundred years before, it is quite certain that the "Seventy" used it in its current sense at the time of making their translation, which Dr. Beecher himself admits was that of eternity; and it is equally certain that, as this word and its cognates, from the time of Plato and Aristotle, was employed in the sense of eternity, as in this sense it was current in the Alexandrian Greek at the time the "Seventy" made their translation, and as Christ and his apostles used this translation in quoting the Hebrew Scriptures, they must have employed it in this sense when speaking of the future state either of the good or of the bad.

Deserted by Cremer and Robinson, who have gone over to Aristotle, and with all the lexicons against him, Dr. Beecher falls back on the common ground that *aion*, *aionios*, etc., mean a limited, instead of an endless, duration. This position is supported by nothing more reliable than that these words are sometimes used in the Scriptures to denote a limited or indefinite period of time: as when the Almighty promised to give the land of Canaan to Abraham and his seed for an everlasting possession; as when God declared the Levitical atonement an everlasting statute; as when he conferred

an everlasting priesthood on the sons of Aaron; as when of the sun, moon, and stars it is said, God "hath established them forever and ever." Now, we readily admit that these words are employed, sometimes, to denote merely a long or indefinite duration. Prof. Stuart says: "In our own language (where eternal and everlasting surely designate a period without end), we often employ the same words to designate *that which seems to have no end, or the end of which is not defined or seen.* Thus we say, *everlasting talker, perpetual scourge, eternal vexation, endless trouble, everlasting disquiet*, etc.—all employed, in common parlance, for that which endures a great while, or for an indefinite period, or which is without intermission; yet who supposes that on this account the words *everlasting, eternal, perpetual, endless*, are not, with the strictest propriety, applied to *time which has no bounds*, or, in other words, to *eternity?*" He further says that "when Gesenius defines it" (*olam* the equivalent of *aion*) "*ewigkeit* [eternity], he rightly defines it. . All the meanings derived from this are only exceptions, and amount to mere examples of *catachrestic* usage—*i. e.*, usage which is uncommon, or aside from the strict sense of the word. Such is the usage in all languages with regard to more or less important words."

As to the lexicons, a passing notice will be sufficient. Buxtorf, Gesenius, and others, define *olam* by eternity, eternal, everlasting. *Aion* and *aionios* have the same definitions given them by Schleusner, Wahl, Schrevelius, Parkhurst, Stephens, Robinson, Donnegan, Cremer, Hedericus, Liddell

and Scott, Passow, Scapula, and Suicer. Others might be catalogued, but these are sufficient.

We now give some examples from the Hebrew Old Testament showing the prevailing use of *olam* in the sense of *eternity, unlimited duration.* The words in italics correspond to, and are translations of, *olam* in some of its forms: 1. Passages which speak of God's covenant as *everlasting.* Gen. ix. 16; xvii. 7, 13, 19. 2. Some passages that ascribe eternity to God, or his attributes. Gen. xxi. 3, *everlasting* God; Deut. xxxiii. 27, *eternal* God; Ps. xc. 2, from *everlasting* to *everlasting;* ciii. 17, mercy of *everlasting* to *everlasting;* Isa. xl. 28, *everlasting* God; lx. 19, *everlasting* light; Jer. x. 10, *everlasting* King. 3. Some passages that speak of the righteous, and one of the wicked. Ps. cxii. 6, *everlasting* remembrance; Prov. x. 25, *everlasting* foundation; Isa. xxxv. 10, *everlasting* joy upon their heads; Dan. xii. 2, some shall awake to *everlasting* life; and some, to shame and *everlasting* contempt. Many others might be given. Prof. Stuart says: "Under the form *l'olam* alone, in the sense of *forever*, Taylor, in his 'Hebrew Concordance,' has arranged some one hundred and seventy-five instances. If we add to these all the various forms of the word to which the meaning, *forever, always, time unlimited,* or *without end,* is clearly to be attributed, several hundreds more must be added to the one hundred and seventy-five cases. It is impossible to doubt in regard to the meaning of the word in the Hebrew Scriptures."

Next we take *aion*, meaning *time unlimited, indefinite, without end; ever, forever, eternity:* 1. Passages which speak of God, or of Christ. Rom. i. 25,

blessed forever, eis tous aionas; also, ix. 5; xi. 36; and xvi. 27. Quite a number of texts are intensive, *eis tous aionas ton aionon, forever* and *ever.* Such are all those that ascribe glory, might, praise, dominion, life, etc., to God, or to Christ, *forever* and *ever.* 2. Passages in which *aion* is used to designate the life, state, or happiness of the righteous: Shall live *forever; never* see death; *never* taste death; *never* perish; *never* die; *abideth,* and shall abide, *forever;* shall reign *forever and ever.* 3. Passages in the New Testament in which *aion* sets forth the duration of future punishment. 2 Pet. ii. 17, to whom is reserved the blaekness of darkness *forever, eis aiōna;* Jude 13, for whom the blaekness of darkness is reserved *forever, eis ton aiona;* Rev. xiv. 11, the smoke of their torment aseendeth up *forever and ever, eis aionas aionon;* also, xix. 3, and her smoke rose up *forever and ever, eis tous aionas ton aionon;* and xx. 10, and they shall be tormented continually *forever and ever*—Greek same as preceding verse. Can we doubt the meaning of *aion* in these cases?

This word is employed some ninety-five times in the New Testament. Of these we have sixteen instanees of its use in ascriptions of praise, glory, honor, etc., to God or to Christ. None of these ean be of limited duration. There ean be no doubt about the five cases that aseribe life to God or to Christ *forever.* There ean be little, also, about the four eases relating to the dominion of Christ. In one case it is said the word of God abideth *forever.* It is also used of the word of God in 1 Pet. i. 23; but we do not count this, as it is omitted by the Cod. Sin., and is regarded doubtful, though we

think on insufficient grounds. It is applied to the future happiness of the righteous nine times. It is used eighteen times in the sense of ever (with a negative), never, always, etc.; and, in most of these instances, of Christ. In five instances it is used of future punishment; and in seven it denotes an indefinite period in ages past, generally eternity past.

We have, then, sixty-four or five cases of its use in the sense of eternity, or time unlimited, without end. "The remaining thirty instances of its use," says Prof. Stuart, "may be classed under the general signification of the Hebrew word *olam* (as employed in the Talmudic and Rabinnic Hebrew), viz., *world* in some sense or other, either present or future, Jewish or Christian." "We come, then," he adds, "by virtue of this examination, to the conclusion that whenever *aion* is employed for the purpose merely of designating *future time* as a *period of duration*, it designates an *indefinite, unlimited time* in all cases," etc.

We shall now endeavor to fix the meaning of *aionios*, a derivate of *aion*, by reference to its usage in the New Testament. It signifies *eternal, never-ending*, and is employed in this sense in describing the future state of the righteous. In forty-two instances it is used with *zoee*. We give a few examples of the use of *zoee aionios*—viz.: that I may have *eternal life;* but the righteous into *life eternal;* in the world to come *eternal life;* believeth on the Son hath *eternal life;* I give unto them *eternal life;* lay hold of *eternal life;* hope of *eternal life;* which endureth unto *everlasting life;* believeth on the Son hath *everlasting life;* etc. We have some nineteen cases of its use

in reference to heaven, things in or belonging to heaven, to the saints, to God; as, *eternal* mansions, glory, consolation, salvation, redemption, inheritance, kingdom, God, praise, things which are not seen, are not made, spirit, covenant, etc. In none of these cases can we doubt that it is used in the sense of unlimited duration. Besides some four instances which refer to the indefinite past, mostly eternity *a parte ante*, we have seven of its use in reference to future punishment. Matt. xviii. 8, eternal fire; also, xxv. 46, depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire; and ver. 26, these shall go away into everlasting punishment; Mark iii. 29, is in danger of eternal damnation; 2 Thess. i. 9, shall be punished with everlasting destruction, etc.; Heb. vi. 2, eternal judgment—*i. e.*, eternal condemnation, or punishment; Jude 6, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire. We have now the whole question, as to the prevailing scriptural use of these words, before us. And what is the result? Why, in every instance of the employment of *aion* and *aionios*, as *olam*, their Hebrew equivalent, in reference to future time, they denote properly and only time unlimited, eternity. We must bear in mind that these are the words employed to designate the duration of God, of Christ, of the Holy Spirit, their glory, attributes, honors, praises, dominion. They are also the words used to denote the duration of happiness of the righteous in the world to come. Can anyone doubt the sense of unlimited duration, eternity, forever? Who will affirm that they mean less? Surely the being, glory, perfections of God, and the happiness of the saints are

not destined to end with a limited period of time, after the lapse of ages. And if these words are employed at least sixty times in the New Testament to denote the continuance of the future happiness of the righteous, and twelve or more times to denote the continuance of the future punishment of the wicked, how can we avoid the conclusion that they are used in the same sense in both cases? Are not eternal life and eternal death, everlasting happiness and everlasting punishment, antithetic forms of expression? If so, is not the word eternal in one case the equivalent of the same word in the other? We agree with Stuart, that the exception here (if such a one must be made) is without any parallel in just principles of interpretation. From the foregoing proofs it is demonstrated that "if the Scriptures have not asserted positively the *endless* punishment of the wicked, neither have they asserted the *endless* happiness of the righteous, nor the *endless* glory and existence of the Godhead." Either these words establish both or they establish neither. If they establish the one, they must establish the other. "We must either admit the *endless* misery of hell or give up the endless happinesss of heaven."

Having disposed of these words, we devote a small space to four other words which occur in the Holy Scriptures, where they are used sometimes, evidently, in the sense of a place of punishment. Those words are Sheol, Gehenna, Hades, and Tartarus. Sheol occurs sixty-three times in the Hebrew Bible; of these it is translated, by the "Seventy," Hades sixty times. Both words mean, in

general, grave, sepulcher, under-world, region of the dead, or of departed spirits. Like all generic words, they are used sometimes in a secondary, or tropical, sense. Their prevailing sense is that already given, but in course of time, as is the case with all such words, as the world learned more of the state of souls after death, their meaning was extended so as to embrace the new idea, and they took on the additional and more specific meaning of a place of future torment. We have numerous instances of this in the Scriptures. Thus the Greek word *theos* denoted an imaginary god. The same may be said of *ouranos*, of paradise, and of many other words. Shall we say, then, that when Jesus and his apostles used these words they meant nothing more than the usual ideas attached to them by the Greeks? Every scholar knows that when the Jews employed Greek words in reference to sacred things they attached to very many of them peculiarities of meaning which may be sought for in vain in classic authors. Such is the case with important words of all languages. Where, then, is the difficulty in supposing that these words were sometimes used by sacred authors differing in sense from their classical meanings? And since there is nothing valid against the employment of words in this way, but the common usage of nearly all words is in its favor, and since the connection and circumstances in which a word stands must alone determine the sense in which the author uses it, let us go to the Scriptures, and, by an impartial and critical examination of the passages where these words are found, ascertain, if we can, their signification in those particular places.

We would remark, *en passant*, that it could not be possible for the heathen Greeks, nor for the Hebrews, even, prior to Christ, to have correct views of the states of men after death. "Life and immortality are brought to light" in the gospel. The Old Testament revelation is not so full and complete on the after-life as the New. The states and abodes of the good and the bad—things conjectural mostly to the heathen, and dimly seen by the eye of faith, under the Old Testament—are, in the New, brought out clearly and strikingly by Him who is the "way, the truth, and the life." In doing this, Jesus and his apostles employed words, already familiar, that had some bearing on the future life; but they set them in such a light—in such a frame of descriptive imagery—as left no doubt about the new idea they intended to convey. And how easy and natural the transition from the horror and suffering of death, the corruption of the grave, the terror and darkness of the under-world, and the fires of the valley of Hinnom, to the horrors of the "second death," the darkness of the "bottomless pit," and the flames of an endless hell!

It is admitted that *Sheol* is generally used in the Old Testament in the sense of grave, sepulcher, under-world; but there are some instances of its use where the sense can hardly be less than that of a world of misery after death. We give but one. Prov. xv. 24: "The way of life is above to the wise, that he may depart from *Sheol* beneath." Here the idea is that by pursuing the way of life we are conducted to heaven, and so escape *Sheol*, or the world of misery beneath. Of the same im-

port are Num. xvi. 30, 33; Deut. xxx. 22; Ps. xlix. 14, 15; Isa. v. 14; 1 Kings ii. 6–9.

The word *Hades* occurs some eleven times in the New Testament, and in meaning generally corresponds to Sheol. In one passage, Luke, xvi. 23, it is used in the sense of Tartarus, or a place of torment. It cannot be denied that, with the Greeks, "Hades comprised both Elysium and Tartarus, or a state of misery and a state of happiness." "Such being the case, the question whether those who go to *Hades* will be happy or miserable there depends, of course, on the question whether they are righteous or wicked, whether they deserve reward or punishment. Admitting that an existence in Hades implies a state which is capable either of happiness or of misery is admitting, of course, that the sinner *may be* 'in torments' while in Hades; and that Dives was in such a state is made certain by Luke xvi. 23." Whether the case of Dives be a real one or a parable cannot change the conclusion. If a real one, it shows what has been; if a parable, it shows what may be. Either way, it settles the question as to the existence of a place of torment, and the future eternal punishment of the wicked. "The parable of Lazarus and the rich man is the sublimest delineation of this and of that side of the grave in its astounding antitheses. What is the trilogy of a Dante, in which he sings hell, purgatory, and heaven, compared with the trilogy of this parable, which places with few, but speaking, strokes the great whole of earth, Gehenna, and paradise at once before our eyes? In the vesture of a figurative discourse, which is taken from the eschat-

ology of his time, the Saviour gives here the most astonishing disclosures, and lifts the veil which covers the secrets of the future. Although the Saviour here speaks of the condition immediately after death—not of that after the *parousia*—it appears, however, that, according to his conception, the sharp separation beyond the grave, between the children of light and those of darkness, becomes, in any event, a cleft and abyss. As well the doctrine of purgatory, as that of the *Apocatastasis*, is opposed by this parable; and, according to the last words of Abraham to the rich man, we can, on this side, expect nothing more for the unbeliever than an irrevocable silence."

Next in order comes *Gehenna*, or more properly *Geenna*, which, the American editor to "Lange's Commentary" says, occurs twelve times in the New Testament, and is always correctly rendered hell. The Valley of Hinnom was situated at the base of the southern declivity of Jerusalem. During the reign of the idolatrous kings, it was dedicated to the worship of the Ammonite god Moloch, in honor of whom human victims, principally children, were immolated by fire. Milton, in "Paradise Lost," describes his worship, thus:

> Next Moloch, horrid king, besmeared with blood
> Of human sacrifice, and parents' tears;
> Though for the noise of drums and timbrels loud,
> Their childrens' cries unheard, that passed through fire
> To his grim idol.

It is not surprising that pious prophets should have called the place where these inhuman, bloody rites were practiced, Tophet—that is, *abomination*.

The pious king Josiah had this place polluted by carrying hither the bodies of dead beasts, and the offal of Jerusalem, to be burned. And as this offal, before it was thrown into the fire, bred worms, and the fires were kept burning perpetually, we have the striking imagery of the "worm that dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched," applied to the future torment of the wicked. This place was so abhorrent to the later Jews that they called it *Ge Hinnom*, or *Gehenna*, to denote Tartarus, the place of future punishment.

The question now is, How did the Saviour employ this word? With him, does it mean the literal Valley of Hinnom, lying on the south side of Jerusalem, or the world or place of future torments, under the figure of this literal valley? Evidently the latter, because the offenses which he says are punishable in the fire of *Gehenna*, or hell, are such as God only could take cognizance of, and punish in this way. The Jewish courts had no power to punish men for anger, for lust, and for the application of opprobrious epithets to men, by literal burning to death in the Valley of Hinnom; and the blessed Jesus well knew that such punishment never would, and never could, be inflicted by them on men here, for offenses of this kind. He could not assert, therefore, that men guilty of these sins were liable to such punishment in this world. God alone can take cognizance of them, and the right to punish them in Gehenna belongs to him. In Matt. v. 22, Jesus says: "Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment"—*i. e.*, the punishment inflicted by the Council of Twenty-

three, or the *septemviri:* "and whosever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be (obnoxious) in danger of the council"—*i. e.*, the Sanhedrim, or great council, which could inflict a severer punishment: "but whosoever shall say (*moreh*), *Thou fool*, shall be (obnoxious) in danger of hell fire"—"*eis teen geenan ton puros:*" lit., *to the fire of the Valley of Hinnom*, a still severer punishment. What does the Saviour mean? That these Jewish councils, or any other court, Jewish or Christian, would inflict literal death, or punishment, on him who should become angry with his brother, or say to him, *Raca*—a term of contempt, meaning *shallow-brains*—or apply to him the term *Moreh—apostate, the hopeless, helpless fool, or atheist?* Absurd! Every sane thinker must know better than to suppose the Saviour meant a literal punishment of these offenses, *respectively*, by *strangling*, *stoning*, or *burning to death* in the literal Valley of Hinnom. "This would be a contradiction of what he had just said—viz.: that the Jews adjudged him only guilty of murder who actually killed a man, and therefore in danger of the judgment. He then adds: 'But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment,' etc., teaching us that it is not the external act only that God observes, and will punish, but also the angry, revengeful spirit. And as he who cherishes a revengeful spirit is guilty before God, and liable to punishment, he who allows this spirit to break out into reproachful language incurs a greater guilt and punishment still; while he who lets loose his passion, in the use of epithets calculated to destroy character, etc., is still more

guilty, and shall receive a more signal punishment, like that of the Valley of Hinnom." Verses 29 and 30 are examples of the same kind. Several other passages, which the reader can easily find, are of the same class and import. Matt. xxiii. 15 is clearer still: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell (Gehenna) than yourselves." This cannot refer to the literal punishment of the literal Valley of Hinnom. So, also, in the 33d verse of the same chapter, where, of the scribes and Pharisees, he says, "How can ye escape the damnation of hell (Gehenna)?" he cannot mean this of burning to death in the literal Valley of Hinnom. Neither can we interpret James iii. 6, where he declares that the tongue is set on fire of Gehenna (hell), as meaning that it is literally set on fire by the Valley of Hinnom. But, were it possible to doubt that this word is employed in the above-named passages in the sense of future torment, Matt. x. 28, and the parallel passage in Luke xii. 5, must forever set this question at rest: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Gehenna). The body might be destroyed in the literal Valley of Hinnom, but the soul *never*. We have now given these words a patient investigation; and what is the conclusion? If there be any power in language to convey ideas; if there be any reliable laws of philological inquiry—of scriptural exegesis; in short, if this question may be settled by arguments, and by principles and laws of

investigation that would effectually determine any other question, it is that the Scriptures do unmistakably teach the doctrine of an eternal hell, where the wicked will be punished for their rejection of Christ the Saviour, and for their sins committed against the majesty of the holy and eternal God. Just as certainly as the Scriptures teach the eternity of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; the eternity of their attributes; the eternity of the happiness of the righteous; the eternity of heaven, of God's praise, and glory, and dominion—just so certainly do they teach the perpetuity of hell, the endless torments of the damned.

Having disposed of the arguments founded on these words so frequently employed in the Scriptures, we now turn to the arguments founded on the great outstanding doctrines of the Bible—doctrines which stand as head-lights in the word of God, and in the economy of redemption.

All unregenerate men are in a state of condemnation. "He that believeth not is condemned already." "Death passed on all men; for that all have sinned;" and "judgment came upon all men to condemnation." This death and this judgment must be eternal, if not removed by Christ. "By nature" we are "all children of wrath." The whole race is involved in transgression and death. "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them." The same act of justice that banished Adam from paradise expelled his posterity also. Man is utterly stripped of original righteousness. The whole world is in rebellion. It is, indeed, a fearful, universal revolt—

without one exception, embracing every soul of man and every element of his moral nature. "There is none righteous, none that doeth good; no, not one." Such is the state of every soul; and nothing can be more certain than that if anyone die in this condition of guiltiness and condemnation he cannot be saved; for "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." If the condemnation in which he abides be not taken away by Christ before death, it will remain forever, unless the opportunity of repentance and pardon is afforded after death, of which we have no proof.

Again, the only condition on which sins can be pardoned, and condemnation removed, is faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; not a cold, dead, barren, speculative belief; not a mere formal, intellectual assent to the naked proposition that Jesus is the Christ; for that would exclude none but avowed infidels, would leave the life unchanged; but it is the trust of the heart, of the affections—a faith that works by love, not by fear, and purifies the soul—a faith full of life, vital, active, "that overcomes the world;" for "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness," not with the head. This great truth was emphasized by Christ: "I say, therefore, unto you, that ye shall die in your sins; for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." The term "therefore" connotes their natural condemnation, "because they were of this world," and also the reason why they should die in their sins, "because they believed not on him." Our sins do not vanish with their perpetration, nor are they forgotten by God. They are "sealed up in a bag,"

"written with a pen of iron," "with the point of a diamond;" "graven on the table of the heart, and upon the horns of our altars." Nothing but the blood of Christ can cancel them, "wash their dismal stain away;" and faith only (*sola fides*) can bring us into contact with that blood. "Without faith, it is impossible to please God." Without it every indictment under the law stands against us, and remains in force. Nothing but the blood of Christ, appropriated by faith, can cause the condemnatory sentence to be reversed, break the seal of death, and cleanse us from all unrighteousness. We are condemned for a breach of the divine covenant of works; we can be restored to life only be embracing the covenant of grace. Unbelief fastens condemnation on the soul, and lays it bare to the stroke of justice. There can be no protection from the law, for it has been transgressed, and knows no pardon; neither is there shelter to the unbeliever in the covenant of grace, for he refuses to enter its sanctuary. Unbelief, therefore, cuts off the sinner from the mercy of God, the atonement of Christ, the favor of heaven. If the sinner die in his sins and unbelief, he is abandoned of God, and divine justice enforces the penalty due to his sins; and if there be no means of pardon after death, he is hopelessly, eternally condemned.

But we advance a step farther, in order to clinch these arguments and leave to the ungodly no ground to hope for future release from his sins. The mediatorial system, under which we now live, is the last and only one God will ever make for the salvation of men. This system, now in operation, is

called the "last times," the "last days." No other is intended; no other will be given. We have now the whole counsel of God in reference to the salvation of men. "There remains no more sacrifice for sin." "Anathema," says Paul, be to man or angel who shall preach any other gospel. The covenant of grace is the highest, grandest effort of infinite love. Surely there can be no greater condescension, no farther down-reaching of the arms of infinite mercy, no grander display of the almightiness of love, mercy, and justice. How shall we contemplate the Eternal One withdrawn within the limits of time and space—the necessary made contingent, the absolute becoming the relative, the infinite enveloped by the finite? What shall we say of the Most High coming down to dwell in a tabernacle of flesh; consenting to become a man, that he might apotheosize men; becoming a little lower than the angels, that he might raise us higher? of Him who was higher than the heavens, brighter than all the sons of the morning, stooping to take upon him the form of a servant, and be found in the likeness of sinful flesh, in order to make friends of enemies, saints of sinners, kings of slaves, and priests of beggars?

Creation was a stupendous work. The thought of the Almighty, "Let there be," sounding through all the inane expanse, where nothing was, and darkness brooded in solemn silence, and from out the nameless void, as from the womb of an eternal night, obedient to the call and teeming with life, come suns and systems that in their measured courses wheel and blaze—how overwhelming! What an

idea of infinite power, majesty, and wisdom does it afford! Yet all this did not tax the powers of the Almighty. He was still able to bring millions of such creations into being. Not so the redemption scheme. This required the highest reach, the grandest sweep, the perfected strength of omnipotent love and mercy; for, in this one work, as the supplement of the sublime drama of creation, culminated in transcendent glory all the infinite, unwasting energies and resources of divine wisdom and goodness. Wherefore, if the sinner refuse to comply with the gracious provisions of this covenant, there remains no more sacrifice for sin, and no future installment of grace to regenerate and save.

An examination of the subject will satisfy us that man can be saved only by *justice* or by mercy; and it is evident that the impenitent sinner cannot be saved by either of these plans. Not by justice, for he has violated the law; nor by mercy, for he refuses the covenant of grace: consequently there is no salvation for him. Under the covenant of grace, the salvation of the penitent is not contrary to justice, nor the condemnation of the impenitent opposed to mercy. In this covenant they are at one, having fully consented to its provisions: justice is satisfied, mercy content; mercy could ask nothing more, justice receive nothing less; the compact is sealed by the blood of Jesus. Should mercy pardon the impenitent, she would violate the compact; should justice punish the penitent, she would break the covenant engagement. Mercy cannot refuse pardon to the penitent, nor can justice hinder it; on the other hand, justice

cannot decline to punish the impenitent, nor can mercy object to it. These attributes are at perfect agreement in the atonement made by Christ. Further, for the Almighty to save impenitent sinners would be opposed to his truthfulness. His law contains both promises and threatenings, and his truth is pledged to make them good. The law says, Life to the good, death to the bad. If either go unfulfilled the truth of God fails.

Nor would the salvation of the impenitent accord with his wisdom; for how can he be reconciled to those whose hearts are filled with enmity to him and to his government? To save such would necessitate a change of plan and purpose. This would stamp the first with imperfection, and therefore impugn his wisdom; but as we are assured that all his ways are perfect, we may be satisfied that his plan is perfect, and therefore he will not change it. And if God should save all men by mercy, without regard to character, we would ask for the proof of his wisdom and goodness in laying our sins upon Christ as a satisfaction offered to justice, if mercy may be dispensed so cheaply and easily to those who despise and reject it? The sufferings of Jesus attest the justice of God, his hatred of sin, and the awful punishment due to it. And as God was too just to spare his Son, though innocent, because he was Surety for sinners, so he will be too just to spare the sinner who rejects that Surety, and despises his gracious work.

The sinner's condemnation may be argued from the frequent urgent invitations of the gospel to come to Christ. How urgent and solemn the invi-

tation given by Jesus! See how he associates rest to their souls with coming to him and taking his yoke upon them! And what do these passages imply? "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near;" "Thou shalt find the Lord, if thou seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul;" "Seek ye me and ye shall live;" "And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." What do these, and many more scriptures like them, mean? I will not darken counsel by comment, but quote one passage which settles the question of meaning: "The hand of God is upon all them for good that seek him; but his power and his wrath is against all them that forsake him."

It may be argued from the solemn warnings and admonitions of Heaven: "Fear him who can destroy both soul and body in hell;" "If thou forsake him, he will cast thee off forever;" "Ye shall die in your sins;" "The sin of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, neither in this world nor in the world to come." Such expressions in reference to the transactions of life would never be misunderstood.

What mean the many promises of good to the righteous, and the threatenings of evil to the unrighteous? Who shall abide in the tabernacle of the Lord? who shall dwell in his holy hill? "He that hath clean hands and a pure heart," etc. "The light of the righteous rejoiceth, but the lamp of the wicked shall be put out." "In his righteousness that he hath done shall he live." "They shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."

"Shall go into life eternal." "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." "The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God." "Indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil." "That they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." "The heavens and the earth which are now, are reserved unto fire against the day of judgment, and perdition of ungodly men."

The condemnation of the finally impenitent is evident from the nature and design of regeneration, justification, and sanctification. Without the first, we are dead; without the second, condemned; without the third, unholy. By regeneration, we have conscious spiritual life; by justification, pardon; by sanctification, purity. To enter the kingdom of God, we must be born again; to have peace with God, we must be justified; to see God, we must be pure in heart. Now, these blessings are conditioned on repentance and faith; hence it is said: "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish;" "He that believeth not shall be damned;" "But he that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life;" "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God," etc.; "Purifying their hearts by faith;" "The fearful, and *unbelieving*, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death."

Upon the final condemnation of the ungodly the Scriptures are remarkably explicit: "Shall cast them into a furnace of fire; there shall be wailing

and gnashing of teeth;" "these shall go away into everlasting punishment;" "into the fire that never shall be quenched;" "where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched;" "but the chaff he will burn with fire unquenchable;" "their end is destruction;" "who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power;" "fiery indignation shall devour the adversaries;" "to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished;" "the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever, and they have no rest day nor night;" "beast and false prophet cast alive into a lake of fire;" "and whosoever was not found written in the Lamb's book of life, was cast into the lake of fire."

Some of our Lord's parables and discourses are quite conclusive on the future state of the ungodly. In the 24th chapter of Matthew, we have two events described—viz.: the destruction of Jerusalem, and the end of the world, the second advent of Christ in the judgment of the great day. Having described this last event, Jesus, in verses 45–51, sets forth the judgment of the rulers of the Church, which ends with "cutting the unfaithful servant asunder, and appointing him a portion with hypocrites, where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth," indicating final and extreme punishment. He then proceeds to describe the judgment on the Church. For this purpose he takes the parable of the ten virgins. This ends with the admission of the five wise virgins to the joyful wedding festivities, and the closing of the doors upon the foolish

virgins, whose slothfulness and negligence unfitted them to be honored guests of the bridegroom. The only answer to their cries for admission is an emphatic denial of their right to enter: "I know you not." They are thus cut off from God, and Christ, and the company of the good and happy, and left to the darkness, and the fierce accusations of a guilty conscience. Then follows the parable of the *talents*, affording a lively picture of individual retribution in the final judgment. Before taking his journey into a far country, the master distributes talents among his servants, according to the ability of each, to improve during his absence. On his return he calls them to a reckoning, giving to the faithful a reward proportioned to their gains, and visiting merited disgrace and punishment on the slothful servant, who had made no use of his talent. The talent is taken from him, and he is cast into (the) outer darkness, where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth. Finally, we have the universal judgment described. The Son of man comes in his glory, surrounded by all the holy angels, and is seated upon the throne of his glory. Before him are gathered all nations. Mighty concourse! Wonderful pageant! He separates, or divides, them into two great bodies, according to character, placing the righteous on his right hand, the unrighteous on his left. He addresses those on his right hand with, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was a hungered," etc. But to them on his left hand he will say: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, pre-

pared for the devil and his angels: for I was a hungered." . . "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment (eternal punishment, *kolasin aionion*); but the righteous into life eternal" (eternal life, *zoeen aionion*). The word for eternal is the same in both instances. If, therefore, it denote the unending happiness of the righteous, it must denote, also, the unending punishment of the wicked. This, too, is the only view consistent with the whole scope of the passage.

While the position here held against Universalism has been regarded justly as one of the strongest, and absolutely impregnable, the parable of the *wheat* and the *tares* is scarcely less decisive of the whole controversy. In the explanation of this parable our blessed Master uses terms easily understood; and, evidently, the terms are to be understood in their literal senses. He expressly says: "He that *soweth* the good seed is the *Son of man;* the *field* is the *world;* the *good seed* are the *children of the kingdom;* but the *tares* are the *children* of the *wicked one;* the *enemy* that sowed them is the *devil;* the *harvest* is the *end* of the *world;* and the *reapers* are the *angels.* As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." Comment is unnecessary. Here is set forth, in strong contrast, the personal exist-

ence of the devil as the embodiment of moral evil, and the founder and center of the kingdom of darkness; and the personality of the Son of man as the Founder and Center of the kingdom of light; the characters of the righteous and the wicked, and the final end, or state, of them both, as they will be manifested at the end of the Christian dispensation, or the end of the world.

The parable of the vine and its branches is of the same import, and equally clear. Those branches that maintain their living, unbroken connection with the vine, flourish, and are fruitful, while those that do not abide in the vine die, are lopped off and burned. There can be no reunion with the vine after that.

It only remains for us to cite one or two more passages before closing our argument. One of these is found in the 2d chapter of the Second Epistle of Peter: "For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment," etc. The argument is, If God spared not the sinning angels, but cast them down to hell, and put them under chains of darkness, there to await a more fearful punishment at the day of final judgment, neither will he spare ungodly, unrepentant sinners, but "reserve them unto the day of judgment to be punished." The word for hell here is a denominative verb, *tartarosas*, which means to *confine*, or to *punish*, in Tartarus. The place denoted by this word is put in opposition to Elysium. It is represented as the place where the distinguished objects of Jupiter's vengeance are confined and

tormented. Passow says this word in Greek designates a subterranean region, as far below the upper parts of *Hades* as the earth is distant from heaven. Those sent to Tartarus were regarded as doomed to *endless* punishment. According to Peter, then, the condition of these fallen angels is irremediable; and so of the unjust, who, like them, shall be cast down to this place of torment. He calls these false prophets and false teachers, to whom is reserved the punishment, or the like punishment, of fallen angels, "*spots* and *blemishes*, having eyes full of adultery, loving the wages of unrighteousness, wells without water, clouds carried with tempest, to whom the mist of darkness is reserved forever." He declares that they bring upon themselves *swift destruction;* that their *judgment lingereth not*, and their *damnation slumbereth not;* and that they shall utterly perish in their own corruption. Jude is not less forcible and explicit. Of the angels that kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he says they are "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." He, too, calls these ungodly men, who had crept in unawares, and were turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ, "*filthy dreamers*, *spots* in their *feasts* of *charity; clouds without water; trees* whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots; *raging waves* of the sea, foaming out their own shame; *wandering stars*, to to *whom* is *reserved* the *blackness* of *darkness forever.*"

THE NOVELTIES OF CAMPBELLISM CONTRASTED WITH CHRISTIANITY.

BY THE REV C. W. MILLER, A.M.

GOD has ordained that Christianity shall depend upon its own manifestations for evidence of its truth. It was introduced into the world to serve certain great moral purposes—the regeneration of human nature and of human society—and consequently it must, in the first place, be adapted in all its appointed means to the end thus contemplated; and, in the next place, it must exhibit this adaptation by its practical operations in the achievement of the results sought. The absence of either of these requisites would inevitably render nugatory all efforts to prove its divine original. A piece of mechanism may be faultless in the finish of its various parts, and in the symmetry of their adjustment, but if it fail to answer any design, and particularly *that* design which was contemplated in its formation, it can have no claims upon our confidence or patronage. In such a case, eulogy degenerates into bombast, and an effort to *argue* the trustworthiness of the object excites only contempt.

Many beautiful and, seemingly, good things may be said of any system of opinions by the abettors thereof; and this capability of being praised is

eagerly seized by enthusiastic friends as infallible evidence of truth; but it must be apparent upon a moment's reflection that no amount of praise, or even of testimony, can substitute the practical operations of a system in an attempt to establish its truth. Thus, no conceivable amount of testimony that praise, deposition, or antiquity could possibly furnish would suffice to establish the truth of the theological or mythological systems of Hesiod and Homer, because under their operation man sank to the station of the brute, and society rotted to the heart. No moral elevation or regeneration was possible under such systems, and accordingly the results which arose out of the inherent character and subjective conditions of them thwarted, and must forever thwart, every attempt to prove their truth.

With the unthinking masses and their pandering demagogues it is a common practice to seize upon the incidental and casual phases of a system, when these are favorable, and urge them as *the* evidence of truth. For example:

1. The intellectual renown of the abettors of a system is confidently and triumphantly pointed to as conclusive evidence. "Can it be," the friends of the system demand, "that men of such gigantic intellect and profound research can be in error?" This they deem unanswerable. But, if it were worth any thing as an argument, it would prove the truth of all the warring and antagonistic dogmas of ancient and modern times; for all, however pitiable in their stupidity or monstrous in their daring, have developed from within, or attracted from without, grand

intellects. It is not, therefore, without significance that St. Paul says: "Ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called." The adherence of "wise men after the flesh" cannot furnish an iota of proof for a system either of philosophy or religion.

2. The numerical prowess of the followers of a system is persistently obtruded upon our attention as an evidence of truth. Because it is flattering to the vanity of partisans to be found with the multitude, they are continually heard praising the "broad way" with its crammed and suffocating majorities. Demagogues confidently throw themselves upon *numbers* as a proof of right. But would not this, if correct, work out calamitous results? Do the three hundred millions of deluded Buddhists establish the bleak atheism and soul-annihilation which constitute the heart of that huge Eastern nightmare? No more do the swelling multitudes which throng under the banners of favorite systems in Christendom establish the truth of the dogmas of those systems. These are the incidental and casual phases of a system. They may, or they may not, be present; but their presence or their absence determines nothing. The religion of the Bible was just as true when the old Tishbite despondingly threw himself under a juniper-tree and "requested for himself that he might die," because he believed he "only" was left, as when it placed the crown of the Roman Empire upon its brow. God never arrays any of these considerations before the world in proof of his truth. On the contrary, he points continually,

as already observed, to the *manifestations* of that truth, saying: "The *works* that I do in my Father's name, they bear witness of me. If I do not the *works* of my Father, believe me not." To his followers Jesus said: "Let *your light* so shine before men, that they may see your *good works*, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." The world is to be convinced of the truth of Christianity not so much by the profound intellectual achievements of its followers in its behalf as by its redeeming power upon the hearts and lives of men as seen in its working.

We have only time to indicate a few of those manifestations by which the religion of the Bible is known to be true.

1. The harmony and agreement of its inspired teachers in the statement of its truths are, in the case of Christianity, an infallible evidence. We say "in the case of Christianity," because no other system on earth is characterized by the peculiarities that Christianity has in the statement of its principles. Its first book was written by Moses, nearly sixteen hundred years before its last book was written by John. Its sixty-six books, composed by about forty different men, and these men scattered from the wilderness of Midian to the island of Patmos, and from the age of the Pharaohs to the first century of the Christian era, could not, in the nature of the case, have had any collusion among their authors. And yet there is not a statement made by Moses that conflicts with any thing written by John. From the beginning to the end of the elaborate announcement of truths, a statement involving every conceivable

form of enunciation—history, biography, chronology, formal teaching, example, etc.—there is not the shadow of conflict or disharmony. The whole grand disclosure, with its infinite variety arising from the peculiarities of different customs, times, and countries, rolls on in unbroken unity and agreement from beginning to end. Infidelity has long ceased to attack the Bible upon the ground of contradiction in its statements. Now, this perfect accord is just what truth demands, and what it invariably presents. Contradiction is *prima facie* evidence of falsehood.

2. The regenerating effect of Christianity upon human life, inducing purity in the individual and philanthropy in the race, may be pointed to with just pride as an evidence of its truth. Modern rationalists, in their insane rage against Christianity, are fond of holding up the *effete* civilizations of Greece, Rome, Asia, etc., as proof of a regenerating force in the mythologies of those peoples equal to that claimed for the religion of the Bible. They carefully conceal the fact that a withering blush mantled the faces of Herodotus, Tacitus, Livy, etc., when they attempted to depict the immoralities and brutal licentiousness which constituted an essential feature of these systems. The utter absence of all eleemosynary institutions, of the education of the masses, of all rights of property, or protection of person; the horrible reign of lust, brute force, and cruelty; the internecine wars that glutted the world with slaughter, without generosity to the fallen or pity for the weak, were the legitimate fruits of those systems. On the contrary, it has been the peculiar

glory of Christianity that it redeems human nature from impurity, and makes a brotherhood of the race. Under its genial sway, the pitiless winter of sin gives place to the summer of righteousness; and the redemption of the world, as evinced by the facts of history, vindicates the rapturous strains of the great bard when, contemplating its saving power upon man, he sang:

> Time will run back, and fetch the age of gold;
> And speckled vanity
> Will sicken soon and die;
> And leprous sin will melt from earthly mold,
> And hell itself will pass away,
> And leave her dolorous mansions to the peering day.
>
> Yea, truth and justice, then,
> Will down return to men,
> Orbed in a rainbow; and, like glories wearing,
> Mercy will sit between,
> Throned in celestial sheen,
> With radiant feet the tissued clouds down steering;
> And heaven, as at some festival,
> Will open wide the gates of her high palace-hall.

Fixing our attention upon these *ab intra* evidences of the truth, St. Paul warns us: "If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth, supposing that gain is godliness; from such withdraw thyself." Every system that works out these results is "of the earth, earthy."

We propose, in this treatise, to take up that modern medley of dogmas exeogitated by the brain of Mr. Alexander Campbell, and show that these just and neeessary canons of evidence, upon which all the friends of Christianity are willing to throw themselves, when its truth is assailed, do unquestionably establish that that medley of dogmas is a human invention, without warrant in Seripture or foundation in reason. In this eontrasting of the novelties of Campbellism with Christianity, we will exhibit the fact that the system is hopelessly inharmonious and contradietory in the statement of its dogmas, and that the dogmas thus formulated through a mob of eontradictions are, many of them, new in the history of Christendom, while none of them find a place on the pages of inspiration. This done, and we will show, if space permits, that the system has evolved from within itself all that catalogue enumerated by the apostle as above quoted (1 Tim. vi. 3–5), and thereby determined its falsehood by its own working.

That we may get this matter before the reader in the most comprehensive and systematie form possible, we propose to name and diseuss the ehief articles in the ereed of Campbellism in the order in which they appear in that system.

The Kingdom of Heaven.—This phrase, or its synonym, *kingdom of God*, is one of the most frequently oeeurring phrases of the Bible. While it is used with a great variety of signifieation by the divine teaehers, yet, in a very large number of instances of its occurrence, it signifies that system of government which God has established over his people.

The Bible holds up before us the terrible fact that sin invaded our world and overthrew the government which God had established over the moral nature of man. Immediately upon this, God instituted measures for the reëstablishment of that government. An atonement for the rebellion was provided, and its gracious provisions at once tendered to the fallen. A redeeming "Seed" was promised, who was to "bruise the head," or break the foreign and iniquitous government which Satan had introduced. Nothing could be made plainer than that He who "is from everlasting to everlasting, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever," and whose infinite wisdom sees "the end from the beginning," did not delay the introduction of his kingdom, or the reëstablishment of his government, in the moral world for four thousand years. He did not even resort to the human expedient of a provisional government during those ages, as is absurdly hinted sometimes. The Almighty did not wander through this province of his great empire, like a discrowned and exiled monarch, until "the day of Pentecost was fully come," about eighteen centuries ago, and then on a sudden discover the practicability or propriety of "setting up" a kingdom. This is the dishonoring caricature which Rome gave to the world, and which has been accepted generally by those organizations by whom a side issue in Christianity is made "the chief corner-stone."

Here we lodge our first indictment against Campbellism. At this point it is intensely anti-biblical and hopelessly popish. We will let its own defenders state the dogma. It will be seen, from what

follows, that it is a fundamental article in their creed that "the kingdom of God" was first "set up" on or about that Pentecost named in the second of Acts. Mr. Campbell said: "Neither are the statutes and laws of the Christian kingdom to be sought for in the Jewish Scriptures, nor antecedent to the day of Pentecost, except so far as our Lord himself, during his life-time, propounded the doctrine of his reign." ("Chris. Sys.," p. 157.) By "Jewish Scriptures" he means the Old Testament. He had just defined "the old Jewish constitution" as a system of religion inaugurated at Sinai, and, following the definition with the sentence we have quoted, he shows plainly, what he elsewhere asserts, that "the Jewish Scriptures," or Old Testament, had to do only with "the old Jewish constitution," and accordingly know nothing of "the statutes and laws of the Christian kingdom." On page 176, speaking of the events on Pentecost, he says: "Hence, in setting up the kingdom of heaven, as in setting up the kingdom of nature, there was a display of divinity," etc. Again: "Now this *first congregation* of Christ, thus filled with the Spirit of God," etc. (P 177.) In the same work he informs us that "this doctrine of forgiveness was gradually opened to the people during the ministry of John and Jesus, but was not fully developed until Pentecost, when the secrets of the reign of heaven were fully opened to men." (P 179.) In the "Debate with Rice" (p. 309), he gives utterance to the following repulsive sentiment: "What clearer or more convincing demonstration that flesh, and neither faith nor piety, was contemplated

in the Jews' religion?" Speaking of the vicious Caiaphas, who was obtruded into the high-priest's office by the foulest means of bribery and political scheming, he says: "The genius of that dispensation allowed such a state of things!" He then exclaims: "No wonder that John the Baptist, and the Messiah, preached a new religion, a new repentance, a new birth, and that flesh must give place to faith, and blood to piety!" These will answer as samples from Mr. Campbell. From them it will be seen he denies that any of the statutes, or laws, of the kingdom are found in the Old Testament; that the religion of the Old Testament, or "the old Jewish constitution," contemplated "neither faith nor piety," so much so that Caiaphas was just as acceptable a high-priest as any man whom the Spirit of God ever anointed for that office; that the entire arrangement, which God himself had effected, "*allowed*" the worst of men to officiate in offices positively declared to be holy; that consequently God never "set up" his kingdom until Pentecost.

In these frantic dreams he has been faithfully followed by his people. For example, Walter Scott ("Chris. Rest," p. 533) says: "To use the apostle's figure, we would say that the first stone of the Christian temple was laid by God: 'Behold I lay in Zion a stone,' etc.; and that it was laid on the day when he said, 'Behold my beloved Son.'" "According to this figure, Christianity commenced when Christ made his first appearance," etc. "The Church of Christ, then, was formed by himself before ever he left the world; and previous to the day of Pentecost the number of the names together

were about one hundred and twenty; all these not having received the Spirit, continued, with one accord, in prayer and supplication for ten days, till the day of Pentecost. But as there was a day on which Jesus entered upon his personal ministry among the Jews—as there was a day when the apostles entered upon their mission to the world—so there was a day when the Spirit came to the Church. That day was Pentecost." (P. 535.) Thus he starts the kingdom of God at the baptism of Jesus, and gives the Spirit for the first time on the day of Pentecost.

Elder Wilkes ("Debate," p. 102) thus states the dogma: "I remark that the apostles were in the first organized, or Christian, Church. They were organized by God, through Christ, as its first members. . . . They were charter members of the Church of Jesus Christ, and the balance you can supply." Page 106, he continues: "I argue, therefore, that at that time [during the ministry of John and Jesus] no persons were actually in it [the kingdom]. This conclusion must be accepted for another good reason, also: that the house, or kingdom, was shut; the door was not open, and Peter held the key. He it was who was to unlock the door to the Jews and the Gentiles, which he had not yet done." Here is a singular instance of the utter confusion of thought which often characterizes an attempt to state for a Bible doctrine a human fancy. Mr. Wilkes represents the kingdom of God as an abstract entity, existing apart from subjects, king, laws, etc., like a vacant house whose doors are locked and the keys deposited in the

hands of an outside party. This confounds all reason. It is the concrete existence, or union, of king, subjects, constitution, laws, etc., that constitutes a kingdom. The instant you separate these, or destroy them, you annihilate the idea of a kingdom. Yet this man supposes the existence of a kingdom without a king, without a constitution, without laws, and without subjects; its doors barred, and its keys in the hands of "an alien." Truly, this is *utopian*. His own Brother Campbell had thus defined "kingdom." "We must," says he, "understand that which is natural before we can understand that which is spiritual. What, then, are the essential elements of a kingdom, as existing among men? They are five—viz.: king, constitution, subjects, laws, and territory." ("Chris. Sys.," p. 148.) If, then, in the days of John the Baptist, "the kingdom of heaven" suffered violence, and men "pressed into it," and Jesus commanded the people then to "seek first the kingdom of God," etc., there must have been some "persons actually in it" as subjects of it, inasmuch as Mr. Campbell gives "subjects" as one of the "essential" elements of a kingdom. This shows the self-annihilating contradiction of opinion among those who have tried to formulate this system; as well, also, the transparent sophistry of Mr. Wilkes. On page 64, the same gentleman calls the period of John's ministrations "the provisional government under John the Baptist," and asserts that "there never was a Jew, however good he might have been, good enough to belong to the Church, or so good that he was recognized as a member of the Church; but it

was said to the very best people that existed at that time, including the apostles themselves, and John the Baptist, that they were not in the Church of Jesus Christ." It is in vain that James commends to Christians "the prophets" as examples of "suffering, affliction, and of patience;" it is in vain that Paul fixes the attention of the Christian racer upon the "cloud of witnesses," the grand company described in Heb. xi., "of whom the world was not worthy," all of whom, "having obtained a good report through faith," were crowned; it is in vain that Stephen declares that Moses "was *in the Church* in the wilderness." Campbellism demands for the support of its dogmas that God have neither a kingdom nor a pardoned worshiper, from Adam to Pentecost; accordingly, its chief priests and rulers cannot find a man, from "righteous Abel" to "just and devout Simeon," "good enough to belong to the Church!"

Elder Milligan ("Scheme of Redemption," p. 288) informs us that, "By the authority of Jehovah, John the Immerser had baptized many of the Jews, as Jews, into repentance for the remission of their sins, but never, before the day of Pentecost, A.D. 34, was any man baptized by the authority of Jesus Christ into the new and sacred relationship which is implied in the formula of Christian baptism. And hence, we find that from that day forward the kingdom of heaven, or the Church of Jesus Christ, is ever spoken of and recognized as a distinct and living reality." Thus, with amazing presumption, he asserts that, previous to A.D. 34, no one was brought "into the new and sacred relationship" to

God which Christian baptism now implies. The repulsiveness of this assertion will be seen when it is remembered that this author makes baptism "bring us, through the divine arrangement, into contact with that blood which cleanses from all sin." (P 407.) Accordingly, before A.D. 34, no man ever came "into contact with that blood which cleanses from all sin!" Isaiah, who had the misfortune to live about seven hundred years before A.D. 34, was led into a grievous mistake at this point. He said of Him who was a "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; AND WITH HIS STRIPES WE ARE HEALED." "Healed" by his atoning suffering, and yet not brought "into contact with that blood which cleanses from all sin!" Elder Milligan had just laid down a principle which swept with an enfilading and destroying fire all this deliberate madness. Page 286, he says: "But it has been often said, and truly said, that in union there is strength. Men can accomplish but little without order and coöperation; and this is just as true in religion as it is in politics, education, internal improvements, or any thing else. And hence the paramount necessity of a religious organization through which all the truly pious might coöperate for the enlightenment, conversion, sanctification, and salvation of the world." Admit this to be true, and then what? Simply this: A Campbellite elder can perceive the "*paramount necessity* of a religious organization by which" men may be "enlightened, converted, sanctified,

and saved," but God, who "sees the end from the beginning," did not make the discovery until A.D. 34! Ages of time roll on, bearing their freight of immortal souls to eternity before God, who has "no pleasure in the death of the wicked," instituted the kingdom through which souls may be enlightened, converted, and saved! Admit this doctrine to be true, and every conception that the Bible gives us of God is swept away.

In the "Living Pulpit"—a volume of sermons from living men in the current reformation, who are styled by the editor "representative men," who "fairly and fully represent the living pulpit of the Christian Church"—Elder McGarvey informs us that "the apostles had heard Jesus testify, but he had not told them all the truth;" and Elder Franklin points us to "the right time, on Pentecost," when the first full message of salvation came from God to man. In order to escape the crushing statement of inspiration that, nearly three years before "the day of Pentecost," "Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel" (Mark i. 14, 15), Elder McGarvey avers that he "who spake as never man spake" did not tell the apostles "all the truth."

It will be readily perceived that if it had been admitted that Jesus, who "baptized not," and who issued no command, that we know of, to anyone else to baptize until after he rose from the dead, had preached the gospel which is "the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth," the su-

perstructure of Campbellism would have been overthrown to its very foundation. Previous to "A.D. 34," the listening ear of a crushed world must not hear the strains of salvation; angels, in their flight from heaven to earth, must utter no word of hope; inspired prophets must give no intimation of deliverance; earth must never have cradled a man who was brought "into contact with that blood which cleanses from all sin;" the long funereal column of humanity, issuing from the cradle, and disappearing in the tomb, must sink into the gloom of life's last struggle "without God and without hope in the world"—if the fundamental position of Campbellism be true. Such is the claim of this system, with reference to the kingdom of heaven. We have allowed its own friends to make the statement, and we proceed now to its refutation by an appeal to the word of God. We take the following definition of the kingdom of God, given by a man who wrote, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, more of the Bible than any other of the inspired penmen: "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." (Rom. xiv. 17.) Here is a most philosophical definition. Paul first clears the subject of difficulties and mistakes by a negative statement: "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink." He then explicitly unfolds, in an affirmative statement, its character and constituents: It is "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Gost." It is not "meat and drink"—*i. e.*, it does not consist in, or depend upon, external conditions. It is not ritualism; it is not ecclesiasticism; it is no pompous array of or-

ganized modes and forms. Here has been the *proton pseudos* of system-builders in all ages of the world. Rome must see an elaborate ecclesiasticism, with its creed formulated, and its multitudinous offices filled, such as Hildebrand carved out, or she will deny the existence of the kingdom of God; the High-church Episcopalian demands *churchism*, robes, achitecture, days, genuflections, and attitudes, or there is no kingdom for him; so Mr. Campbell's system must find a given ordinance—baptism—administered in a particular way—immersion—or it is utterly impossible to have the kingdom of God. Now, the Bible discloses the truth that "the kingdom of God" may, and often does, exist in the absence of any or all of these, and that the presence of any or all of these cannot of themselves bring in the kingdom of God. It "is righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." It was the overthrow and destruction of righteousness, peace, and joy that crowned with disastrous success the enterprise of hell against our race. But, as soon as this calamity befell man, God instituted measures for his recovery; not "a provisional government," but "an everlasting kingdom;" not a tentative expedient, to be abandoned when other circumstances should arise, but a covenant of mercy, "confirmed before of God in Christ," and, being confirmed, "no man disannulleth or addeth thereto." An atonement for sin was made, not by "the blood of bulls and of goats," which "could not take away sins," but by "the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God." Neither was the efficacy of this offering withheld from the world until

four thousand years had expired; but Christ was a "Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Immediately, therefore, upon the fall of man, all the redemptive measures now in operation were devised and tendered to the fallen. A conquering "Seed" was at once announced. The sinning Cain was informed that "a sin offering lay at the door." A place of the divine presence was at once established, and all the necessary *media* of access appointed. Suggestive symbols were erected at the place of the divine presence to assist the mind of the penitent worshiper. An "infolding fire" told of God's consuming wrath toward sin; a "propitiatory sprinkling with blood" told of "the blood of Christ," that "purges the conscience" from sin; and the overshadowing cherubim pointed to redeemed humanity arising out of the atonement of Christ. To this atoning blood Abel came in full assurance, and through faith in it "obtained witness that he was righteous." If he was the first man saved from sin, then with him was the kingdom of God, which is "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," first set up. There was the restoration of God's government, which sin had overthrown, and it only required that every man be brought where "righteous" Abel stood to make the establishment of God's kingdom universal and complete. Now, as others were from time to time brought to this point, they naturally flowed together as a homogeneous body, and formed such rules and regulations for the control of the body as the ever-varying conditions of human life suggested as being necessary. Their bond of union was not

in their assent to any particular form of police, but in the fact that they who were once "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world," now had "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." This separated body of saved persons has been variously styled in the sacred volume, according to the stand-point from which it has been viewed—such as "people of God," "Israel," "family of God," "fold," "flock," "saints," "fellow-citizens," "household of faith," "vineyard," "Mount Zion," "the holy city," "holy nation," "Church," "kingdom of God," etc. They have often unhesitatingly responded to names of reproach given by their enemies—as "Nazarenes," "Christian," etc. Of all these titles none has been so frequently employed as that of "kingdom." It, more forcibly than any other, sets forth the idea of the restoration of God's authority over a soul. The Hebrew *malchooth*, and its cognate, *malcheo*, which the Septuagint renders by *basileia*, is found in the Old Testament about one hundred and forty-five times, being translated in our authorized version by "kingdom," "kingly," "realm," "reign," "empire," "royal." In this multitudinous use it is applied alike to God and men, and always sets forth the idea of *government*, or *recognized authority*. When used of God, as it often is, it simply conveys the idea of the reëstablishment of his dominion over the soul; not a police arrangement for the control of an organization. Hence the kingdom of God is sometimes declared to be with an *individual*, as well as with a multitude. (Luke xvii. 21.) The Hebrew

mind, having been familiar with the *malchooth*, or *basileia*, of the Old Testament for fifteen centuries Christ and his apostles accommodated their speech to this mental training of their first auditors, and accordingly, *basileia*, as a term expressive of the re-establishment of "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," appears on the pages of the New Testament about one hundred and fifty times. It will greatly assist us in a right understanding of the matter before us to mark the following necessary discriminations in the use of the phrase "kingdom of heaven:"

1. Contemplating, as it does, the reädjustment of the soul's relation to God, so that he who was an "alien and a foreigner" may be reïnstated in the "righteousness, and peace, and joy" which constitute the heritage of God's children, when the soul has already realized God's saving designs through Christ, the "kingdom of God" is said to be "within you." (Luke xvii. 21.)

2. When Jesus would teach that the present order of things in this world cannot promote the reëstablishment of God's government over the soul, he does it by the assertion, "My kingdom is not of this world"—*i. e.*, there is an invincible antagonism between the present order of things in this world and "righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost."

3. When the ultimate goal of the divine plan of redemption and the highest aim of human life and effort are combined in one view, they are stated by "Seek ye first the kingdom of God." (Matt. vi. 33.)

4. Sometimes this "kingdom of heaven" is represented as *present*—*e. g.*, Matt. xi. 12: "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." Ch. xii. 28: "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you," etc. Sometimes this "kingdom" is represented as *future*—*e. g.*, Matt. xxv. 34: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Luke xxi. 31: "Know ye that the kingdom of God is nigh at hand;" etc.

Now, we are not to suppose from this that there was a "kingdom," or "provisional government," *present*, which was to be destroyed at some future time, and then a *future* kingdom "to be set up." This is to trifle with the word of God. But this *present* and *future* aspect of "the kingdom of heaven" arises out of the fact that the blessing of salvation, "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," is sometimes viewed as *now* attainable, or as actually enjoyed; and sometimes it is viewed in its perfected development in the heavenly world, where the possessor of it shall be freed from the antagonism of "this world." Or, as Cremer has well stated it in his "Biblico-Theological Lexicon:" "From all this it would appear that the *kingdom of God* is primarily *salvation*, and as such is both the possession and the hope of the *ekklesia*." "The kingdom of God" is *now* "within" us, as a blessed possession, an undoubted realization; at the same time, it rises before the vision of the people of God as the perfected glory, as the consummated work of redemption an-

nouneed by "the Judge of quiek and dead," in the thrilling weleome: "Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

In the same sense "the kingdom of heaven" is said to "approach," "draw nigh," ete. When John the Baptist and the Lord Jesus announeed "righteousness, peaee, and joy in the Holy Ghost" to the apostate and guilty Jews who had become "ignorant of God's righteousness," they did so by declaring that "the kingdom of heaven" was approaching. In the same sense the missionaries who landed in the harbor of Hawaii, one of the Sandwieh Islands, in 1819, might have said to those islanders who were without "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," "The kingdom of heaven is at hand," or "draws nigh;" and yet, in the sense above stated, "the kingdom of heaven" is still *future* to them. Mr. Campbell and his brethren have seized upon these expressions, "will build," "draws nigh," ete., just as papists seize upon the expression in Matt. xvi. 18, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock," ete., and, interpreting them in the interests of their dogmas, but without any regard whatever to their obvious import, attempt to make them teach that previous to "Penteeost" no "kingdom of heaven" existed.

In attempting to bolster up this disastrous dogma, they have eonfounded that separated people, whom God has always had in the world (whether many or few), with politico-eeelesiastieal arrangements whieh God has temporarily appointed. It is a eommon

practice with these teachers to take also the corruptest periods and phases in the history of such politico-ecclesiastical institutions, and, holding these up in the most repulsive light possible, demand if *this* could have been "the kingdom of heaven." Thus, Mr. Campbell ("Debate with Rice," p. 309) says of the Jewish institution: "But there was neither moral nor spiritual qualification necessary to any office. Aaron's first-born son, if he had a complete animal body and a reasonable soul, though he were as wicked as Hophni and Phinehas, as Annas or Caiaphas, might legitimately officiate in that institution. Priests were the sons of priests, high-priests were the sons of high-priests, as were Levites the sons of Levites. What clearer or more convincing demonstration that *flesh*, and neither faith nor piety, was contemplated in the Jews' religion?" Now, there is no light in which this can be considered that it will not be seen to be untrue. That many bad men crept into the priesthood through bribery, mob violence, political dominance, etc., just as bad men creep into the ministry now, no one can deny; but that the licentious and bloody Hophni, Phinehas, Annas, and Caiaphas were as *legitimate* priests as any that God provided for under that institution is abhorrent to all truth. In the law creating that priesthood it was solemnly enacted that the priest "put difference between holy and unholy, and between unclean and clean; and that they teach the children of Israel all the statutes which the Lord hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses." (Lev. x. 10, 11.) Was it true that, while the priest was to "put difference between holy and unholy," the law of

God which appointed that priest did not itself "put difference between holy and unholy?" Mr. Campbell says, "There was neither *moral* nor spiritual qualification necessary to *any* office." The truth is the priest was laid under such solemn obligations to be holy that if even he sinned through ignorance (Lev. iv. 3, 13) he must seek pardon. When the corrupt sons of Eli sinned in their sacred office, instead of being approved of God, as Mr. Campbell intimates they were, God said to their father: "Wherefore the Lord God of Israel saith, I said indeed that thy house, and the house of thy father, should walk before me forever; but now the Lord saith, Be it far from me; for them that honor me I will honor, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed." (1 Sam. ii. 30.) This was said directly of the "Hophni and Phinehas" whom Mr. Campbell arrays along with Caiaphas as "legitimate priests!" The rejection of vicious priests is placed alone upon the ground of their vice: "I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hand" (Mal. i. 10), was the language of God to the "priests, that despise my name" (ver. 6). Chapter second, he tells them that his covenant with Levi was for "life and peace," "for the fear wherewith he feared me, and was afraid before my name," not because he had "a complete animal body and a reasonable soul," as Mr. Campbell supposed. "The law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was not found in his lips: he walked with me in peace and equity, and did turn many from iniquity." (Mal. ii. 6.) As long as (and not one moment longer) these priests followed this example

they were accepted of God. Now, the time came that they became corrupt. Wicked kings in Israel set up in these holy offices their corrupt creatures, as did Jeroboam, 2 Chron. xi. 15. Under the Roman rule in Palestine, the high-priest's office, because of its dignity and influence, was filled by the rulers of the country with the most sordid and corrupt men. Such were Caiaphas and others; but never was it supposed that such incumbents were legitimate. Paul said to one of these "high-priests," "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall." (Acts xxiii. 3.) To attempt, therefore, to prove that God had no "kingdom" among men, because bad men insinuated themselves into holy places, is the last and most desperate resort of conscious weakness.

But Mr. Campbell and his brethren persistently fix the attention of their followers upon "the Jewish institution" as the only thing approximating a "kingdom of heaven" before "the day of Pentecost." Holding this temporary Church-and-State arrangement before the eyes of their people, and making prominent the corruptions and evils that afflicted that people, without discriminating between civil and ecclesiastical—that which was appointed of God and that which came in through the innovations and traditions of men—they confidently ask, "Where was the kingdom of God in all this mass of evil?" This is just as wise and just as candid as it would be in us to collect together all the corruptions in doctrine and viciousness among incumbents in the high places and low of the Church-and-State arrangement in England, and from these argue that there is no "kingdom of heaven" in that island.

The fact is "the Jewish institution," or that order of things introduced at Sinai, was a parenthetical clause in the history of "the kingdom of heaven," designed to aid, by means of symbols, etc., a people who, under Egyptian slavery, had fearfully degenerated. Paul compares it to a "school-master," appointed for the guidance of children, and to continue only so long as the childhood estate of that people should continue. It introduced no new principle in religion. Its incoming did not mark the beginning of a new religion, nor did its outgoing change or in any way modify any fact in "the kingdom of heaven." It was a system of ordinances and symbols "ADDED," as the apostle says, only for a specific time and purpose; and when that time and purpose were fulfilled, it passed out as it had come in, effecting no change in "the kingdom of heaven." Thus saith St. Paul: "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was ADDED because of transgressions, TILL the seed should come to whom the promise was made." (Gal. iii. 19.) It "was ADDED" to what? When those ordinances were appointed fifteen centuries before the incarnation, to what were they ADDED? We answer, To *that* which is sometimes called "the promise" (Gal. iii. 16); sometimes, "the covenant, that was confirmed *before* of God in Christ" (Gal. iii. 17); and sometimes, "the kingdom of heaven." Justin Martyr ("Dialogue with Trypte," c. 22) says: "And that you may learn that it was for the sins of your own nation, and for their idolatries, and not because there was any necessity for such sacrifices, that they were likewise enjoined, listen to the manner in which he speaks of these by

Amos," etc. He then quotes Amos v. 18–27; vi. 1–7. From Abel on, God had a people who had "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." During the full sway and authority of the Sinaitic institutions this people existed in the midst of the commonwealth of Israel, in no sense dependent upon that institution for their character as the people of God. In proof of this let us glance at certain facts. It will be remembered that when the Israelites first crossed over into Canaan, the Mosaic tabernacle, containing the Ark of the Covenant, was set up at Gilgal. It was afterward removed to Shiloh, where it continued through the high-priesthood of Eli. During his high-priesthood the Ark was captured by the Philistines and carried into their land. It is a remarkable fact that the Ark never was restored to the Mosaic tabernacle, but after an eventful history of seven months in Philistia, and of eighty years "in the house of Abinadab in the hill," and of three months in the house of Obed-Edom, it was placed by David in the tabernacle which he had built for it on Mount Zion. During this time the Mosaic tabernacle had been moved from Shiloh to Gibeon. There each stood until Solomon built the temple. Now, in the Mosaic tabernacle at Gibeon, all the Levitical ritual was punctually observed; at the same time a pure, spiritual, non-ritualistic worship was offered on Mount Zion, where no slain beast bled and no incense smoked. This tabernacle on Mount Zion, with its pure, spiritual worship, stood through the entire reign of "carnal ordinances" in the temple until that almost universal declension in piety among the Jews came, during

which "the Tishbite" thought himself the only one left who feared God. Here, while the mistaken multitude who were wedded to ordinances sought righteousness "not by faith, but, as it were, by the works of the law" (Rom. ix. 32), there was a "remnant," who, like Abraham, "believed in God, and it was counted to them for righteousness." They worshiped him there without

> —— bleeding bird or bleeding beast,
> Or hyssop branch or sprinkling priest,

and were received by him as "his people."

"Mount Zion" thus became one of the designations of the "kingdom of heaven"—Mount Moriah, where the temple stood, never did. When piety fell into great decay, and the cause of God seemed lost in the earth (as it often has since), "ZION said, 'The Lord hath forsaken me, and my Lord hath forgotten me.'" More than twenty-five hundred years afterward, Mr. A. Campbell repeated the same allegation against the faithfulness of God. He said Zion was a fleshly thing, that contemplated neither faith nor piety, and that a licentious Hophni and Phinehas, and a blood-thirsty Caiaphas, were representative men in her holiest places. But God says, in answer to Zion's wail and Campbell's slander: "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee. Behold, I have graven thee upon the palms of my hands; thy walls are continually before me." (Isa. xlix. 14–16.) Amidst this greatest apostasy, Amos stood upon Mount Moriah, near the temple where

many of the prophecies were delivered, and looking over to Mount Zion, where the wreck of David's tabernacle lay, and then glancing down the future until his eyes rested upon "the fullness of the time" when "the Seed" should come and this burdensome ritual would expire, he declared: "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old" (Amos ix. 11); which prophecy James quoted (Acts xv. 16), with this explanation: "That the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things." This he gave as the reason why they should not "trouble" with the Levitical ritual "them which from among the Gentiles are turned to God." His reasoning is that, during the existence of the Levitical ritual, God accepted those who in the tabernacle of David sought for "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost;" and now that that ritual had expired by limitation, and "the tabernacle of David" was to be "restored," it would be the height of folly to reïmpose "a yoke upon the neck of the disciples." Jesus, the promised "Seed," had "blotted out the handwriting of ordinances which was against us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." (Col. ii. 14.) Thus it appears that the departure of the Mosaic institution was hailed as a happy event in the history of "the kingdom of heaven." That institution was not "the kingdom of heaven," nor was it any essential part of it. "The kingdom of heaven" had preceded it nearly three thousand

years. It had existed parallel with it for fifteen hundred years, and when that institution had served its end and numbered the days of its reign, "the kingdom of heaven" started, with unimpaired vigor, upon its grand mission of subduing the world.

Now, to confound this with a corrupt politico-ecclesiasticism, which perverted the law of God and fell "through unbelief" into the most fearful apostasy recorded in the pages of history, is either pitiable stupidity or unpardonable daring. This, however, Campbellism, as we have seen, does.

We proceed to show that every thing which the Lord Jesus and his apostles taught as essential to "the kingdom of heaven" had already been made known by inspired teachers centuries before "the day of Pentecost."

Nothing was more prominent in the teaching of Jesus and the apostles than the all-important matter of "remission of sins." At the house of Cornelius (Acts x. 43), Peter said of Jesus Christ: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." According to this, God never led a prophet up the shining mount of vision, and permitted him to look down upon the unenacted future, without making him bear witness to the grand truth that "remission of sins" is by faith in his Son. The saving power of Jesus has thus come down through the stormy centuries, giving "righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost" to all who have believed in him.

Paul says: "But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by

the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe, FOR THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE." (Rom. iii. 21, 22.) Here, again, it is stated that it was the recognized mission of "the law and the prophets" to make known the righteousness of God by faith in Jesus Christ. Accordingly, the same "remission of sins" has been taught in "the kingdom of heaven" in every age of the past. God did not save men in one age in one way, and the men of another age in another way; nor did he offer pardon to the Jew through one system, and to the Gentile through another, "FOR THERE IS NO DIFFERENCE." Christ, the Saviour, was as well known a thousand years before his crucifixion as he was a thousand years after it. "Abraham rejoiced to see his day, and he saw it, and was glad." (John viii. 56.) All "the fathers" that came out of Egypt "drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ." (1 Cor. x. 4.) Moses "esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt." (Heb. xi. 26.) And Peter says: "Of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you; searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." (1 Peter i. 10, 11.) Because "the Spirit of Christ" was in "all the prophets" and writers of the law, they all directed the heart and faith of the generations above bleeding beasts and smoking altars to him "who

through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God." Of the first discourse that Jesus preached after he rose from the dead, it is said that, "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself." (Luke xxiv. 27.) If you would see *how* "the prophets" taught the people of their day concerning Christ, turn to Isaiah liii. 1–12. Here his grand life and its atoning merit are contemplated as present and in full force, though this prophet lived seven hundred years before the incarnation. Isaiah told the men of his day: "The Lord *hath* laid on him the iniquity of us all. He *was* oppressed, and he *was* afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; he *is* brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth. . . he *was* cut off out of the land of the living, for the transgression of my people, was he stricken." Ver. 5: "But he *was* wounded for our transgressions; he *was* bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace *was* upon him; and with his stripes WE ARE HEALED." Here was a present Christ and a present salvation, seven hundred years before that day on which Campbellism assumes Christ was first truly preached. The scripture which I have just quoted was that which the Ethiopian eunuch was reading when Philip "joined himself to the chariot." (Acts viii. 32, 33.) "Then Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him Jesus." So had Isaiah done.

Thus, he who is "the chief corner-stone" was plainly preached, believed on, and rejoiced in by

the people of "the kingdom of heaven" from the very beginning of man's career as a sinner.

The same is true of the preaching of the gospel (Heb. iv. 2); of the Church and membership in it (Acts vii. 38, etc.). Our space will not permit us to notice each in detail. Paul declares that he taught "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come." (Acts xxvi. 22.)

Instead, therefore, of "the kingdom of God" having been "set up" on "the day of Pentecost," as Campbellism assumes; and instead of the way of life and righteousness having been first published in "A.D. 34" of the Christian era, as Elder Milligan supposes and as his system demands, "the kingdom of heaven, which is not meat and drink, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost," has moved down through the desert of centuries, perfuming the ages with "a sweet-smelling savor."

Reader, this unscriptural dogma, this hideous caricature, which turns humanity adrift upon the sea of ruin, without a light-house or a harbor, for four thousand years, and which drives the Almighty into exile from his own kingdom for forty centuries, was conceived and brought forth in Mr. Campbell's effort to dispossess "little children" of their place "in the kingdom of heaven."

This is one of the novelties of Campbellism. Having disproved it by an appeal to the Scriptures, we will now show that its abettors have crossed their own track at every conceivable angle in their attempts to state it. "Christian System," p. 163, Mr. Campbell says: "Some Baptists, for the sake of

immersion, and some of *our brethren in the reformation*, for the sake of *immersion for the remission of sins*, seem desirous to have John in the kingdom of heaven," etc. This, of course, Mr. C. condemns. Strange, however, that men who can tell to a day just how long God delayed "the setting up" of his kingdom should nevertheless be in doubt whether it began *three years* before "Pentecost" or *three years* after John the Baptist! Page 165, Mr. C. says: "Jesus often unfolded its [the kingdom's] character and design in various similitudes; and every one who understood and received these *principles* was said to press into the kingdom," etc. Yet this was *three years* before that day on which Mr. Campbell repeatedly assures us the kingdom was first "set up." Think of men "pressing into" that which yet had no existence! Page 166, he says: "The kingdom of God was evidently in the Jewish institution till Jesus died." Mark that. Now, on page 308, "Debate with Rice," he said: "*That flesh, and neither faith nor piety, qualified not only for membership, but for every holy office in the Jews' religion.*" Page 309: A man, "though he were as wicked as Hophni and Phinehas, as Annas or Caiaphas, might legitimately officiate in that institution." And yet this was the very institution which contained "the kingdom of God till Jesus died!" If this be true, then God himself ignored "the difference between holy and unholy." We might greatly extend this catalogue of absurd contradictions, but it is needless. Those we have given are taken from their most carefully-prepared statements of their dogmas. If contradictions appear

in *these*, they must be inherent in the system, which fact shows the system to be false.

Remission of Sins.—No principle, or doctrine, is more prominent in the word of God than this. To secure remission of sins is the aim and end of the great scheme of deliverance devised by Heaven. Jesus Christ was exalted "for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins." It is, therefore, a fundamental doctrine. Any system which errs at this point errs at the center, and its error will necessarily ramify itself through the entire body. On no point is the error of Campbellism more radical than on this. As in the item just treated, so in this—we will let the abettors of this dogma state their own case. Speaking of the day of Pentecost, Mr. Campbell says: "Immersion for the forgiveness of sins was the command addressed to these believers—to these penitents—in answer to the most earnest question, and by one of the most sincere, candid, and honest speakers ever heard. This act of faith was presented as that act by which a change in their state could be effected; or, in other words, BY WHICH ALONE THEY COULD BE PARDONED." ("Chris. Sys.," p. 195.) Again (p. 197): "All these testimonies concur with each other in presenting the act of faith—Christian immersion, frequently called conversion—as that act, inseparably connected with the remission of sins, or that change of state of which we have already spoken." Let it be remembered that he here says "immersion" is that act "by which *alone* they could be pardoned," and that immersion is "*inseparably* connected with remission of sins." On page 201, he calls "the

water" "the mother" in the work of regeneration, and says: "Hence the Saviour put the *mother* first, and the apostles follow him;" and then adds, "Regeneration is, therefore, the act of being born; hence its connection always with water." Truly this is the gospel in the water! In the "Rice Debate," p. 442, Mr. Campbell thus delivered himself: "Baptism, my fellow-citizens, is no mere rite—no unmeaning ceremony—I assure you. It is a most intellectual, spiritual, and sublime transition out of a sinful and condemned state into a spiritual and holy one. It is a change of relation not as respects the flesh, but the spirit. It is an introduction into the mystical body of Christ, by which he necessarily obtains the remission of his sins."

We will not occupy much more space in quoting on this subject. It is universally recognized that in all their teachings baptism is presented by the advocates of this system as an indispensable requisite. In the "Living Pulpit" Elder Burges says: "If it now be asked, What are the elements which make up a scriptural answer to the question, 'What must I do to be saved?' this is the reply: 1. Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. 2. Repentance toward God. 3. Immersion into the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit." In the same book Elder Logan declares that the place, or act, where God meets the sinner is in "the institution" of "Christian baptism." Dr. Hopson valiantly brings up the rear, thus: "But will I be damned if I am not baptized [immersed]? Certainly. Why not?" etc. This is unequivocal language. They had been taught by "the author and finisher of their faith"

to believe that no water no blood of Christ! Thus he asserts in the "Christian System," p. 215: "There is, then, a transferring of the efficacy of blood to water. . . . God has transferred, in some way, the whitening efficacy, or cleansing power, of water to blood, AND THE ABSOLVING, OR PARDONING, POWER OF BLOOD TO WATER." "Yes," he continues, "as God first gave the efficacy of water to blood, he has now given *the efficacy of blood to water.*" Accordingly, he, and his brethren after him, can find no remission of sins out of immersion. Never was there a more stupendous fraud palmed off upon a credulous and obsequious people. The doctrine of baptismal efficacy in regeneration, or remission of sins, was introduced at a very early period in the Christian era. Many of the early converts to Christianity had been teachers of, and believers in, what is known as "the Oriental Philosophy," a system which made all evil an inherent property of matter. Water was believed to have some efficacy in removing it, and consequently it was an essential element in their purifications. When these persons entered the Christian Church, they brought these absurd notions with them, and extensively disseminated them. Some of the most eminent writers among the early "Fathers" were imbued with these sentiments. Now, when they saw baptism performed under such solemn circumstances as usually attended it, their old faith saw in this a confirmation of its truth. Accordingly, baptism was proclaimed a saving ordinance. Divine energy was supposed to reside in its water. Every allusion to water by an inspired teacher was eagerly

seized as a proof-text, and every law of interpretation ignored to make way for the saving power of baptism. Upon the rise of the papacy proper, this dogma was seen to be an important element of power to the priest, and accordingly the people were taught that in the hands of the clergy God had deposited the power of remission. The Council of Trent, assembled in 1545 to oppose Luther, made the saving efficacy of baptism one of the most prominent items put forth by it. Through these "undevout" channels Mr. Campbell received the dogma, and made it "the chief corner-stone" of his system. Following in the footsteps of the parties we have named, he and his brethren have distorted texts and ignored all the settled laws of interpretation, in their desperate efforts to find support. We shall take the texts on which they rely, and show how utterly they fail to support this system.

Acts ii. 38: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." As this text is the Gibraltar of the system under consideration, we shall give special attention to it. A most vicious and dangerous policy is resorted to by the abettors of this system in their interpretation of this passage. For example, Elder Wilkes proposes to leave out the phrase "in the name if Jesus Christ," and then bring "be baptized" and "for remission of sins" together, thus patching up a phrase out of the dislocated members of the sentence not otherwise found in the Bible. This is shocking, and might lead to untold abuse. The phrase "in the name of

Jesus Christ" is the key to the text. That phrase, to Jewish ears, such as Peter then addressed, was equivalent to *faith*, or *trust*, in Jesus Christ; and that *faith*, or *trust*, in Jesus Christ was what Peter taught for remission of sins. To establish this is to overthrow Campbellism to its foundation. We propose to establish it in two ways: First, by the genius of the language used by Peter; and, seeondly, by Peter's own declarations afterward. The phrase "in the name of Jesus Christ" is, in the language used by Peter, *epi to onomati*, and is an idiom, or peculiar phraseology, implying *reliance upon*, or *trust in*, Jesus Christ. The very highest authorities on the New Testament idioms so decide; as, for example, the great Winer, pp. 392, 393, says: "Figuratively, *epi* denotes, in general, the foundation *on* whieh an aetion, or state, rests;" and after numerous referenees, he continues: "Here belongs, also, *epi to onomati tinos*, to do something *upon* the name of some one—*i. e.*, in doing it to rely upon, or have reference to, the name of some one." This is the decision of a master whom all respect. We have selected a few illustrations of this prineiple out of a multitude, and will here give them. Matt. xviii. 5: "And whoso shall receive one sueh little ehild *in my name*—*epi to onomati*—receiveth me." Here the sense is obvious—*relying on*, or *trusting in*, me. Mark xiii. 6: "For many shall come *in my name*—*epi to onomati*—saying, I am Christ; and shall deceive many." That is, they relied on the name of Christ, though in an evil sense, for the success of their imposture. Luke ix. 49: "And John answered and

said, Master, we saw one casting out devils *in thy name—epi to onomati*—and we forbade him because he followeth not with us. And Jesus said unto him, Forbid him not; for he that is not against us is for us." Here it is clear that he who cast out the devils *in the name* of Jesus did it *relying* on him, and Jesus so recognized it when he said this one was for him. But it is useless to multiply instances. Let it, then, be remembered that in Jewish idiom to do any thing *in the name* of the Deity was to do it *relying* upon him. Their Scriptures were full of such instances. The *name* of God was synonymous with *faith* in God. See this strongly set forth by Dr. Alexander, in "Kitto's Cyclo. Bib. Lit.," article "Name." Of the use of the name of Jesus Christ, he says: "Men believe on his name, are baptized for his name, have life through his name, are saved by his name (Acts ix. 12), are justified by his name, assembled in his name," etc. When, therefore, Peter used this idiom, "in the name of Jesus Christ," it imparted to his Jewish hearers "faith in Jesus Christ," and this "faith in Jesus Christ" was "for remission of sins"—not baptism.

To make this position impregnable, we now turn to Peter's after-statements concerning remission of sins. Upon other and equally important occasions he made known to men what is for remission of sins. Now, if upon such occasions he taught that "baptism is for remission," then we surrender Acts ii. 38, notwithstanding the genius of the language is against that theory; but if upon those other occasions he taught that faith in Jesus Christ "is for remission of sins," then is our interpretation established; for being

inspired by the same Spirit, he could not teach one thing on one day and the very opposite on another.

"God made choice from among" the apostles, "that the Gentiles, by the mouth" of Peter, "should hear the word of the gospel, and believe." (Acts xv. 7.) Never was an inspired teacher sent upon a more important mission. He went to "the Gentiles," those who were to make up the grand army of conquest in all after ages. The Jews were shrinking to their center, and would soon pass from the notice of the world as a factor in its great events. "The kingdom of heaven" was about to pass to "the nations"—the millions of the Gentiles. That, therefore, was one of the grandest occasions in the history of man, when Peter, delegated by Heaven, and prepared by a miracle, carried "the word of the gospel" to the Gentiles. When Cornelius was directed to send for him, it was said, "He shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do." (Acts x. 6.) When Peter afterward rehearsed the matter to the apostles, he said the announcement made to Cornelius, when directed to send for him, was, "Who shall tell thee words, whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved." (Acts xi. 14.) To tell Cornelius, and through him countless millions of Gentiles, "words whereby they may be saved" was the mission on which Peter was sent. Now, what was his statement on the subject of "remission of sins?" We may expect the most explicit information here; for he is to speak to a people now wholly unacquainted with Jewish idioms. Hear him (Acts x. 43): "To him [Jesus] give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever *believeth in him shall*

receive REMISSION OF SINS." That needs no comment. As soon as these words of salvation were uttered, "the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word." Now, Campbellism teaches that before remission of sins a man cannot receive the Holy Ghost. Elder Milligan ("Scheme of Redemption," p. 276) says: "The Holy Spirit cannot, and will not, take up its abode in the heart of any man until after that it has been purified by the blood of Christ. Till then, it stands at the door and knocks (Rev. iii. 20); but it never presumes to enter until the *body of sin has been destroyed*, and the soul of the believer cleansed by the blood of atonement." But these people who had "received the Holy Ghost" had not yet received baptism! "Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, *which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?*" If, according to Milligan, the Holy Ghost "cannot and will not enter" into a man "until the body of sin has been destroyed, and the soul of the believer cleansed by the blood of atonement," then baptism had nothing to do with the destruction of sin, or the cleansing of the souls of these Gentiles; for they "received the Holy Ghost" before even any mention was made of baptism. Here, therefore, Peter exactly harmonizes with our interpretation of his language at Pentecost. We affirm that the phrase "in the name of Jesus Christ" (Acts ii. 38) means "faith in Jesus Christ," and that that "faith in Jesus Christ" is for the remission of sins. He so declares, Acts x. 43.

Again: We turn to Acts xv. 9, and find an additional confirmation of our position. "Certain men

which came down from Judea taught the brethren, and said, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." (Acts xv. 1.) These false teachers aimed to thrust circumcision between a penitent soul and the cross of Christ, just as Mr. Campbell thrusts baptism between that cross and the soul. "And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter." It was a grave matter, indeed, "to consider" what is necessary to do "to be saved." Peter was among them, and one of the chief speakers. "And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them [Gentiles] witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us [Jews]; and put no difference between us [Jews] and them [Gentiles], PURIFYING THEIR HEARTS BY FAITH." Here is a second deposition from Peter, coinciding exactly with our interpretation of his language at Pentecost. "To purify the heart" is but a change of verbiage to express the idea of "remission of sins." Can it be supposed that he who once taught, as Campbellism assumes he did, that without baptism there can be no remission, here, as also in Acts x. 43, declared that purification of heart, or remission of sins, is obtained by faith in Jesus Christ? This would be to array the man against himself, as well as against "all the prophets" and all the apostles who witnessed that "whosoever believeth in Jesus Christ shall have remission of sins."

We now follow Peter to his Epistles, as he does not appear after this in The Acts. If he taught "baptism for the remission of sins" at Pentecost, it is reasonable to suppose he would reässert it in the two mature and deliberately-prepared Epistles he afterward wrote, or in some way confirm it. Now, in the only allusion he makes to baptism in these Epistles, he distinctly and emphatically declares that "baptism does not put away sin." We quote the statement (1 Peter iii. 20, 21): "Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ," etc. The force of this statement may be easily brought out. Thus, Noah and family "were saved by water;" we are saved by baptism. The saving of Noah and family by water was a type, as is indicated by the statement that baptism is a "like figure," or, as it is in the Greek, *antitupon*, from which we have the word *antitype*. An *antitype* is that which corresponds with and answers back to a preceding *type*, and the relation between these demands that there be no more in the *antitype* than is found in the *type*. In this case, being "saved by water" was the *type*. Was "remission of sins" involved in *that* salvation? Verily not. Noah had been a righteous man, accepted of God, for more than one hundred and twenty years before he was "saved by water." If, now, there was no "remis-

sion of sins" in the *type*, there cannot be remission of sins in the *antitype* without a palpable violation of all laws of language. Whatever, therefore, being saved by baptism may imply, it *cannot* involve remission of sins. But Peter forever banishes the possibility of deducing baptism for remission of sins by adding, "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." The word "*filth*" is a trope for *sin*. In Revelation xxii. 11, we read, "He which is *filthy*, let him be *filthy* still." Here we have the word which Peter used, with only a grammatical change which affects not the sense. Here, as elsewhere, it means *sin*. Now, he assures us that "baptism does not put away sin." That is the simple statement, when the figure is removed. It is not without great significance that he whose language has been most abused of all the inspired writers deliberately puts it upon record that "baptism does not put away sin." Mr. Campbell and his brethren declare it to be that by which a man necessarily obtains remission [or putting away] of sin." Reader, which do you believe? Peter, or Campbellism? But does not "baptism now save us?" Yes. How? Just as "water saved" Noah. Water separated between Noah and a wicked world, and baptism pledges us "to renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the carnal desires of the flesh, so that we may not follow or be led by them." And in this sense, and this alone, it is said that "baptism doth now save us."

We have now taken all of Peter's statements on this subject. To Cornelius he preached "remission

of sins" through faith in Jesus Christ. In the council at Jerusalem he reässerted that the heart is purified "by faith," and in his First Epistle unequivocally declares that baptism does not put away sin. Now, if it is possible to fix the sense of language, then have we determined that at Pentecost he taught that reliance upon, or faith in, Jesus Christ is for remission of sins.

We have not space to consider other passages but feebly claimed by the abettors of this theory. In redeeming Acts ii. 38 from their abuses we have plucked the keystone from the arch, and left their superstructure in ruins. We shall devote now a few moments to the work of showing that remission of sins by faith in Jesus Christ is the unanimous statement of all inspired teachers. Peter says it was the testimony "of all the prophets;" with them agree, necessarily, "all the apostles."

By reference to Acts xiii. 38, 39, it will be seen that St. Paul uses "forgiveness of sins" and "justify" as interchangeable terms. In his Epistles he generally uses the latter term. With this fact borne in mind, let us turn to his writings, which constitute more than half of the New Testament. The Epistle to the Romans is a masterly and exhaustive discussion of man's condition as a sinner, and of the divine method of recovery from sin. After a clear statement of man's wretched condition, from chapter i. to verse 19 of chapter iii., he announces that "God hath set forth" Jesus Christ "to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past." (Verse 25.) Now, the question is, How can

a sinner avail himself of the benefit that is thus lodged in Jesus Christ as the propitiation for sin? This question St. Paul first discusses *negatively*. He says: "By the deeds of law [the article *the* is not in the original] there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." (Verse 20.) This declaration he elaborates, showing the impossibility of justification by obedience to law—*any* law, whether of sacrifice or of baptism. "But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work." (Chap. xi. 6.) Having demonstrated that justification could not be by works of obedience to any law ("for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law"—Gal. iii. 21), he lays down this proposition: "that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." (Rom. iii. 28.) In support of this he adduces the case of Abraham: "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." Now, when was this? When he was performing acts of obedience to law? No. His faith was counted for righteousness while he was yet "uncircumcised" (chap. iv. 10)—*i. e.*, more than a quarter of a century before he was "justified by works." James ii. 21. "The gospel was preached" to him (Gal. iii. 8); it was "mixed with faith" (Heb. iv. 2) when he heard it; and his faith was "counted for righteousness." Having established the fact that Abraham was justified by faith, without the instrumentality of any ordinance or law, he makes this use of the example: "Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe

on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead." (Rom. iv. 23, 24.) It was put to record that Abraham was justified, or pardoned, when he believed, to set forth to all ages God's universal and unvarying method of forgiving sin, "that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." (Gal. iii. 14.) Justification by faith, without the association of any law, ordinance, or rite, was therefore no afterthought; neither was it an *expedient* devised for men who lived before baptism, or who might die under such conditions as to make baptism impossible. God specifically provided for it, and made it known, as the universal and unvarying law of his kingdom. So saith the apostle: "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen [*ta ethnee, the nations*] through faith, preached before [beforehand] the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations [*ta ethnee*] be blessed." (Gal. iii. 8.)

We have not space, nor is it necessary, to elaborate this matter further. It was the testimony of "all the prophets," and the burden of all apostolic teaching, that forgiveness of sins is by faith in Jesus Christ. Accordingly, when penitent men fell down before these inspired teachers, and said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" their reply was, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." (Acts xvi. 30, 31.)

We conclude the discussion of this subject by showing that the most revolting and self-destroying contradictions have constantly characterized the

efforts of the abettors of this dogma to state it. In his "Christian System," p. 234, Mr. Campbell says: "But one thing we do know—that none can rationally, and with certainty, enjoy the peace of God, and the hope of heaven, but they who, intelligently and in full faith, are born of water, or *immersed for the remission of their sins.*" That is emphatic. It incontinently cuts off *all* the unimmersed! Now, turn to his "Debate with Rice," p. 519, where he says: "Because I do not make baptism absolutely essential to salvation IN ANY CASE," etc. Ah! No man can "enjoy the peace of God and the hope of heaven" without "immersion for the remission of sins," and yet he does not "make baptism absolutely essential to salvation in any case!" Well, can a man have salvation who *cannot* have the peace of God and the hope of heaven? Again: "And if being born of *water* means *immersion*, as clearly proved by all witnesses, then remission of sins cannot, in this life, be constitutionally enjoyed previous to immersion." ("Chrs. Sys.," p. 208.) There, again, is the unqualified "cannot." Now, turn to the "Rice Debate," p. 618, and hear him: "Now, as faith in God is *the first* principle, the soul-renewing principle, of religion—as it is the regenerating, justifying, sanctifying principle—without it, it is impossible to be acceptable to God. With it, a man is a son of Abraham, a son of God; an heir apparent to eternal life—an everlasting kingdom." Let it be remembered that Mr. Campbell invariably puts faith, as he says above, as "*the first* principle." It always must come before baptism in his system. Then, what have we? Only this: a man having

"the soul-renewing principle of religion," "regenerated," "justified," "sanctified," "a son of Abraham," "a son of God," "an heir apparent to eternal life," and yet "*cannot* constitutionally enjoy remission of sins!" In the face of his emphatic "cannot," he himself had given the world the following statement of his own case: "From the time that I could read the Scriptures, I became convinced that Jesus was the Son of God; I was also fully persuaded that I was a sinner, and must obtain pardon through the merits of Christ, or be lost forever. This caused me great distress of soul, and I had much exercise of mind under the awakenings of a guilty conscience. Finally, after many strugglings, I was enabled to put my trust in the Saviour, and to *feel* my reliance on him as the only Saviour of sinners. From the moment I was able to feel this reliance on the Lord Jesus Christ, I obtained and enjoyed peace of mind. It never entered into my head to investigate the subject of baptism, or the doctrines of the creed." ("Memoirs of A. Campbell," vol. i., p. 49.) Here was "peace" *enjoyed* before immersion. Now, reader, when a man can't make his own experience and his theory harmonize, it is a sad case. What would the world think, if, after reading Paul's account in The Acts of his conversion, we should turn to his letter to the Romans and find every statement of the conversion contradicted? Would it not prove Paul to be a false teacher? Does it not work the same result on Campbellism?

Mr. Wilkes says ("Debate," p. 206): "Nor do I believe there is any virtue adapted to remove a

man's sins, *in the water*, or the element in which he is baptized. I do not mean that, nor do my brethren mean that, nor did they ever mean that." But Mr. Campbell says, of immersion, that it was that "by which ALONE they could be pardoned," and that the Holy Spirit "calls nothing personal regeneration except the ACT *of immersion;*" and, "Immersion *alone* was the *act* of turning to God;" and, "It is not our *faith* in God's promise of remission, but our going down into the water, that obtains the remission of sins." Mr. Campbell, the author and finisher of this faith, thought there *was* virtue in the water. He accordingly deliberately declared that "God has transferred" the absolving, or pardoning, power of blood TO WATER." ("Chris. Sys.," pp. 195, 202, 209, 215, 232.)

Mr. Wilkes (p. 50) says: "It was not true of the transgressor under the Old Testament that his sins and iniquities were forgiven finally and fully. They were only laid over, and they were remembered against him until Shiloh come," etc. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, David, the translated Elijah, and a host of others, were rejoicing in heaven, among the angels, while their unpardoned sins were "laid over" here on earth and "remembered against them!" Mr. Campbell says: "They received a *final* and *plenary* remission of sins by reason of the ransom then prospective," etc. ("On Baptism," p. 105.) And, "They had as true testimony, as strong faith, and as striking emblems as we have. Many of them through faith obtained a high reputation, were approved of God, and admired by men for their wonderful achievements."

("Chris. Sys.," p. 180.) Unfortunately for these grand heroes of virtue, whose faith shines upon the darkness of the past like a glorious constellation, Elder Tolbert Fanning *fanned out* all their hopes, thus: "The generations of four thousand years had passed from earth WITHOUT HOPE." ("Living Pulpit," p. 518.) Thus this mobocratic wrangle proceeds with reference to a fundamental question of Bible truth. We have carefully searched their writings from first to last, and have utterly failed to find any two of their rabbins in harmony upon this or any other question, save only, and always, *immersion*. H. T. Anderson, probably the most scholarly man among the abettors of the dream of baptism for remission of sins, saw the anti-biblical and popish character of the dogma, and not long before his death, when he stood amid those short and honest hours of life when men push deceptions from them, utterly repudiated it. He said: "Pardon me for saying that the form of words, 'baptism for the remission of sins,' is essentially Romish." "Baptism in water for remission of sins can never be sustained," etc. There is no agreement in this system upon any other of its fundamental points. We have not space to specify and cite proofs of this, but will let the following statement of Mr. Campbell himself, who, in the maturity of the movement, surveyed the wilderness of contradictions which it presented, suffice: "Every sort of doctrine has been proclaimed by almost all sorts of preachers, under the broad banners, and with the supposed sanction, of the begun reformation." ("Mil. Har.," quoted in "Debate with Rice," p. 858.) Now, if the Bible

presented such a scene of confusion, contradiction, antagonism, etc., among its writers, what friend of it could hold up his head and contend for its truth? Who would not see in these internal fermentations and explosions satisfactory evidence of falsehood? Who, if lost in the Mammoth Cave, the lights extinguished, and involved in palpable darkness, would accept the leadership of guides who could not agree among themselves whether they should go forward or backward, to the right hand or to the left? Will men do with their *souls* what they would not with their *bodies?* God forbid!

Its Origin.—All *true* reformations have been characterized by certain homogeneous features. For example: The leaders have not been *professional*, or *perfunctory*, reformers. Reformation was not a *trade*, or *business*, with them, but God literally "thrust them out" to the great work. Witness Elijah, John the Baptist, Wiclif, Luther, Wesley, etc. They came to their places as reformers through birth-pangs which almost convulsed their natures. Again: They made no effort to *find* topics, or points, for reformation. They did not go about hunting, under every little peculiarity of custom or eccentricity of manner, for something to inveigh against. On the contrary, the work rose on every hand, and forced itself upon them. Now, a glance at the history of the "novelty" under consideration will not only show the fearful contrast between it and all reformations which God has set on foot, but will infallibly indicate that it was conceived in jealousy, brought forth in passion, and nourished by the spirit of war and strife.

Thomas Campbell, the father of Alexander, came to the United States, in 1807, and settled in Pennsylvania as a Presbyterian preacher and school-teacher. Two years afterward, 1809, he was joined by Alexander and the rest of the family, whom he had left in Europe. During the two years that he was here without his family he fell into serious trouble with his Presbytery, and was arraigned for trial. When Alexander came to his father in 1809, he found him in a violent war with his Church, in which war the son, as was natural, sided with the father. The antagonism increased in intensity until the father and son determined to abandon the Church of their choice. No grave doctrinal changes had, as yet, taken place in their minds, as is made manifest by their biographer. ("Richardson's Memoirs," vol. i., pp. 327, 328.) They were simply involved in one of those vexatious Church difficulties which hundreds of good men have gone through without abandoning their Church. On the 12th day of June, 1812, they were immersed by a Baptist preacher, told their "experience," and took shelter in a communion just as far as possible from the one they had left. This, also, was natural under the circumstances. Once the Presbyterian Church was abandoned, under the exasperating circumstances of a "Church trouble," it was *natural* that they should go as far from it in their new affiliations as they could. Alexander Campbell remained there but a few years. His restless and pugnacious nature, and his *penchant* for strife, which had been aroused by his father's troubles, soon placed him, in the Baptist Church, where he had found his father

in the Presbyterian Church in 1809. He was arraigned and cited to appear before his Association at its next session, to answer "charges." Before that Association met, however, he availed himself of the chance for a *flank movement* which the government of the Baptist Church afforded him, cut the church that he had charge of out of that Association, erected it into an independent Association, denied the jurisdiction of the Association that had arraigned him, threw his banner to the breeze, and proclaimed himself the reformer of the nineteenth century! Thus, by sheer ecclesiastical *wrangling*, without any reference whatever to fundamental doctrines, he reached his platform of reformation. Then began a careful search after something among the sects to war upon. Missionary societies were "peculation and speculation," preachers were "trained" in theological schools (like the one *they* now have, for instance, at Lexington), preachers received "pay" for preaching, Churches "called" preachers, etc. These were mortal heresies, and he was set for their destruction. Valiantly did he war upon these wind-mills, until, like the valorous knight of La Mancha, the delusion was about to depart and leave him "in his right mind," when Elder Scott proposed "baptism for the remission of sins." He at once wrote it upon his helmet, and planted himself afresh upon the war-path. This is the simple history of this modern reformation. There was not one element in its beginning that indicated that Heaven had any thing to do with it. It was literally born of human passion. It has ever since existed among the religious denominations of

the land as an element of strife—not against an ungodly world so much, but against Christian bodies who are seeking, according to their best understanding, to serve God and obtain heaven. They have now existed long enough as an organization to begin to manifest, in *results*, the character of materials and principles at work *within*. They are falling into decay. Crimination and recrimination are becoming the order of the day among them. One of them (Elder P.) charges that they are a worse despotism than the Roman Catholic hierarchy; another (Elder B.) declares that "licentiousness," "domestic disgrace," "gallantries," and "amours," are known to exist among many of their most prominent teachers. The incessant war they have waged against a personal, spiritual religion has worked out the fearful result of a cold and soulless materialism, in which all is merged into priestly manipulations and churchly rites.

Reader, we have only space to give a synopsis of the case. But take it as it stands before you, and ask yourself these two questions: Is this heterogeneous mass of commingled antagonisms THE Church of Jesus Christ? and, Can I afford to commit my soul to its molding influences? Ponder these well, and may God lead you in "the way everlasting."

THE DIVINE NATURE AND THE DIVINE GOVERNMENT MYSTERIOUS, YET PRODUCTIVE OF JOY AND GLADNESS.

BY THE REV DRUMMOND WELBURN.

"The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof. Clouds and darkness are round about him: righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne.—Ps. xcvii. 1, 2.

"I WILL appear in the cloud upon the mercy-seat," said the great Jehovah. Israel is told that "the Lord said that he would dwell in the thick darkness." This cloudy dwelling-place of the Most High was on a blood-besprinkled mercy-seat, over the tables of the law, in the holy of holies of the tabernacle and temple. Dwelling in this thick darkness, his eye was upon his law, showing righteousness and judgment to be the habitation of his throne. His throne was a blood-besprinkled mercy-seat, indicating his willingness, through the shedding of blood, to extend mercy and grant remission of sins to the penitent believer. Since Jesus by the sacrifice of himself has obtained eternal redemption for us, we have boldness to enter into the holiest by his blood, and can distinctly perceive how God can "be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus:"

yet to our imperfect vision clouds and darkness still seem to surround the nature and the government of God. To finite minds the Infinite One must ever be incomprehensible. If we could comprehend him we should be his equals. We could not give to an equal the homage of our hearts. Man cannot find out God to perfection, but the study of his nature, his attributes, and his government, must ever be our most ennobling employment. There is in the revelation of himself and his purposes much that rises above our reason, but nothing that is contrary to reason. Far as our feeble sight can penetrate into his limitless domains, we discover such order, grandeur, and beauty, as convince us that the infinite beyond must be equally calculated to excite joy and gladness. Let us, therefore, in humble adoration look, through the light of the divine word, with steadfast gaze, into some of the sublime wonders of his nature and his government.

The being of a God, one who never began to be—an eternal, self-existent, uncaused being, the great first cause of all things—may be too mighty a conception for the unaided human intellect; but when it is once suggested from above, that intellect readily reasons, by its well-known law of cause and effect, that if there ever had been a period when nothing existed, it is impossible that any thing ever could have existed. It perceives a created universe of matter and mind, in which it traces indubitable evidences of design, as well as power; and necessarily infers that the author of the creation must be not only an all-powerful energy, but also a designing mind. This eternal, self-existent, spiritual being

the Scriptures reveal as our Creator, Redeemer, Preserver, and Judge.

The mode of the divine existence may be to us involved in clouds and darkness. We may not be able to conceive how Father, Son, and Holy Ghost can be one and indivisible, the only proper object of all religious worship; yet why should it be deemed a thing incredible with us that the first great link in the chain of being should be threefold, if man, created in the image of his Maker, is a triune being? if he has a physical, an intellectual, and a moral nature? if his mind is a trinity in unity, embracing intellect, sensibilities, and will? Why should we doubt the teachings of the word of God in reference to a trinity in unity in the divine nature? If every human being experiences in himself a longing for society, a necessity for companionship, why should a skeptical theology be allowed to consign to a past eternity of companionless, unfellowshiped existence the divinity in whose image man was made?

We cannot perfectly comprehend the ineffable union of divinity and humanity in the one person of the Lord Jesus Christ. We cannot explain the indwelling of "all the fullness of the Godhead bodily" in him who "had not where to lay his head;" yet the vicarious sufferings of that divine-human Saviour, the shedding of his blood, the making of his soul an offering for sin, the agony of his expiring anguish, are *felt* to have been absolutely necessary in order to our redemption. That he died for our sins and was raised for our justification, that he ever liveth to make intercession for us, has com-

forted millions of penitent souls. That "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us," was "God manifest in the flesh," "God with us," "the Son of man" as well as "the Son of God," makes him just such a Saviour as we need. "While he is man with man to pity, he is God with God to save." Since he who sways the scepter of the universe once trod the paths of earth in human form, "was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin," "we may come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need."

The existence of evil in a world governed by a God who is infinite in wisdom and benevolence, and omnipotent in power, is regarded by many as inexplicable. If we say sorrow followed sin—that natural evil was introduced to punish, restrain, or prevent moral evil—the question naturally arises, Why was moral evil suffered to enter? Can it be shown in the investigation of this sad subject that "righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne?" Let us see. Was there a period in the past eternity when only God existed? Did he subsequently create nebulous matter, and afterward form innumerable worlds, and send them circling through space? Did he people seas with fishes, air with birds, and cause the beasts to tread the fields of earth? Among these creatures of his hand was there aught that could resist his will? was there any thing that could freely and intelligently offer to the Creator the homage due to the divine majesty? Should omnific Power have paused here in his mighty work, and left his universe without a created intellect to enjoy

its grandeur or celebrate the worship of its glorious Architect? To create beings in the image of his own intellectual and moral nature would be to endow them with his own freedom, to the utmost extent of their capacity. If capable of rendering free, intelligent, acceptable adoration and service, they must of necessity be equally capable of refusing that service, and of rebelling against divine authority. He did create such rational beings; some of them did rebel: was this rebellion necessitated by the Almighty? If it had been, then the guilt would have been his; and they would have been the innocent victims of his mysterious malevolence. God is not the author of sin—he has ever prohibited it, and threatened it with condign punishment; but while his published will has forbidden sin, it is asked, Has not his secret will necessitated and brought it into being? So some have taught, but surely it is not now necessary to defend the great Jehovah against such calumniators. The first transgressors had not even the poor excuse of the presence of temptation to mitigate their guilt. No evil example allured their wayward feet into forbidden paths; the companionship of the pure, and the blessedness of spotless personal holiness, was their glorious heritage. Yet they sinned; they kept not their first estate. The spotless archangel, by voluntary rebellion, transformed himself into a fiend of darkness, and his associates in crime shared his dark destiny.

When it is shown that a holy God cannot in any sense be the author of sin, we are asked, If God did not necessitate sin, and yet foreknew all things,

why did he not prevent the sins which he foreknew? Knowledge is not causal; it does not cause any thing. Whether it be divine knowledge or human knowledge—whether it be knowledge of the future, the present, or the past—the event is not caused by the knowledge, but the knowledge is caused by the event. If the event had been different, the knowledge of it must have been different. Those who would have the Almighty prevent the things which he foreknew, would have him to be self-deceived in knowing, or seeming to know, that which could have no existence in the past, in the present, or in the future; or, still more absurdly, to know a thing in order not to know it. "Righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne," not less in the banishment of fallen angels and impenitent men than in rewarding his faithful hosts; yet the sinner, forgetting the conscious freedom with which he walks the road that leads to death, tries to lay upon his Saviour the blame of his self-sought ruin. In this how inconsistent is he! Does he censure legislators for providing prisons for the incorrigibly vicious? does he blame judges, juries, and sheriffs, for incarcerating criminals? would he turn all our convicts loose to prey upon innocent, unoffending millions? Would not such a course be the extreme of cruelty to law-abiding citizens? Yet some would have the high and mighty Ruler of the universe pull down his prison-house, and turn loose among the innocent subjects of his government the abominable and the vile of every age and every land. Others, rather than part with their sins, would fain indulge the unscriptural hope that, after writhing in torment

uncounted ages, they shall rise to thrones of blessedness in heaven. If, in the future state, a new evangel to the damned be proclaimed, those who now preach to perishing sinners will be the first to gladly bear the tidings to the lost. But what if we now had a revelation promising heaven at last to the scorched and seared denizens of the bottomless pit? Who, in his sober senses, would choose such a route to heaven, while the King's highway of holiness lies near, and opens fair? Who would for ages seek the companionship of bad men and devils as a proper preparation for the joys of a holy heaven? These great questions of universal interest, around which, to many minds, clouds and darkness have gathered for ages, have claimed so much of our attention as to preclude an extensive notice of a thousand minor mysteries which crowd upon our thoughts. But for this we should like to ask, Why do three-fourths of the human family live and die without hearing the gospel? and ask wealthy, ease-loving Christians to answer at the bar of their own consciences, Why? In Christian lands, why are godless families suffered to rear their offspring as if they intended them for Satan's lawful prey? why falls the patriot in the strife for freedom? why reigns the tyrant over subject realms? why do the wicked triumph, and the righteous suffer? why dies the petted child of the doting millionaire, while the orphan heir of penury and want lives on?

But enough. What we know not now we shall know hereafter. Let this suffice for our comfort: If "clouds and darkness are round about him," still "the Lord reigneth," "and righteousness and judg-

ment are the habitation of his throne." The Lord reigneth, not Satan. He does not share with the prince of evil spirits a divided empire. Is not the evil one reserved in chains of darkness to the judgment of the great day? He cannot go beyond the length of his chain; his control over the natural world is limited by the wisdom of the infinite and the power of the omnipotent; his influence over the character and conduct of man extends no farther than man himself permits. The Lord reigneth, not chance. He who made the world still holds it as in the hollow of his hand. The Lord reigneth, not nature. "Nature is but the name of an effect whose cause is God." The laws of nature, what are they but the will of the Creator impressed upon the workmanship of his hand? True, the government of God is a government of law; but the great Lawgiver has never become the slave of his own legislation, nor used his own omnipotent power to fetter his own almighty hands. His moral law is a transcript of his nature, and can never be abrogated nor suspended; but over the laws by which he governs the material universe he holds constant and absolute control. He guides the stars in their courses, and wheels the planets in their orbits. Earth hangs upon his will, and gladdens in his smile; he piles her mountains, scoops her valleys, and spreads out her plains; he pours her floods into their channels, and leads her rivers in their courses. Oceans own his power; his voice hushes their storms into stillness. In ancient times he made the waters stand on heaps, that his people might pass dry-shod through the sea; he robbed the flames of their

power to burn, and led his servants through the fiery furnace, without the smell of fire upon their garments; he caused the lions to forget their appetite for blood, and join with angels in standing guard over his prophet. The Lord reigneth. When he dwelt on earth in human form, diseases fled at his bidding; palsy quit its hold upon the trembling frame; the roses of health bloomed on the leprous cheek; the deaf heard his voice; the blind beheld the wonders of his power; at his approach death dropped his leaden scepter, and the grave gave up its prisoners. That same blessed Jesus still reigns. Though we see him not, he still wears the crown of universal empire. He reigns to enthrone himself in the grateful hearts of a regenerated race; to make "all things work together for the good of them that love him;" to protect his Church, perpetuate her existence, and make her gloriously and completely triumphant over all her foes; to rob the grave of its victories, pluck the sting of death, and finally, through death, to destroy him who had the power of death—that is, the devil—"for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet."

The limited geographical knowledge of the psalmist's age led him to call Palestine and the adjacent regions "the earth;" the more distant parts of the globe he called "the many, or great isles." Hence the exhortation of the text must be understood as calling all mankind to rejoice, and be glad because the Lord reigneth; not stoically to submit to a government that cannot be overturned; not simply with Christian meekness and resignation to ac-

knowledge an authority which it would be wrong to resist; but rejoice and be glad, and in jubilant ecstasy laud and magnify the righteous Ruler of the universe. Why should you not? He lavishes his blessings upon you; under his gracious protection you dwell among your own people; at your approach "every dimple on the cheek of home" smiles you a hearty welcome; partial friends bless you with their love, and cheer you on your heavenward pilgrimage. Are you a wanderer far from kindred hearts? Why that sadness? "Stranger is a holy name." The all-seeing eye has watched your every step, in all your wanderings; the almighty arm has protected you through every danger. "God setteth the solitary in families;" "the Lord preserveth the stranger." Here among his people you in your Heavenly Father's house may rejoice and bless his holy name. Are you a widow? Turn your tearful eyes heavenward; lay your bleeding heart open to the gaze of your sympathizing Saviour; lift your trembling voice to his throne of power; the scepter of the universe is in the hand of your best Friend; rejoice and be glad. Are you an orphan? He calls himself "a Father of the fatherless." He says: "Leave thy fatherless children, I will preserve them alive." He is the Helper of the fatherless. Then rejoice and be glad that you have such a Father. Are you bereaved and lonely in a selfish world? has death removed your loved ones? has the grave hidden them from your sight? He says: "Call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." His ear is open to your cry, his hand outstretched to help in

time of need. Your loved ones are not lost, but gone before; they await your coming. The Lord reigneth; let grief give place to gladness. Are you poverty-stricken? "He raiseth up the poor out of the dust; though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." "God hath chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom." Praise him, then, to-day, while struggling for your kingdom and your crown. Are you persecuted and slandered? "Your witness is in heaven; your record is on high." He who is for you is more than all that can be against you. The Lord reigneth; rejoice and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in heaven. Are you a poor lost sinner, with the wrath of God abiding on you? Do you feel that you are "without God, and without hope in the world?" Lift up your head; the day of your deliverance is at hand. The Lord reigneth. To your vision clouds and darkness may seem to be round about him; but his throne is a mercy-seat. He delights in "forgiving iniquity, transgression, and sin." "He hath redeemed you from the curse of the law;" "suffered for you;" "died for you."

For you the purple current flowed,
In pardons, from his wounded side;
Languished for you the Son of God;
For you the Prince of glory died.
Believe, and all your sin 's forgiven;
Only believe, and yours is heaven.
While Jesus' blood, through earth and skies,
Mercy, free, boundless mercy, cries.

O sinner, embrace that mercy now, and let your

own glad heart add its rejoicings to the general praise! Then there shall not only be joy and gladness on earth, but joy in the presence of the angels of God. "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father—to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever! Amen."

INFANT BAPTISM, AS TAUGHT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY THE REV. M EVANS.

"Of such is the kingdom of God."—Matt. xix. 14; Mark x. 14; Luke xviii. 16.

THESE are the words of Jesus. Our Lord speaks of infants—of living, not dead, babes. He speaks of an infant then in his embrace—one on which his hand then rested in benediction. He does not speak of the heavenly rest, but of the association of saints here on earth, known as his Church. It is that kingdom of which God is the acknowledged King. It is that "whole family in heaven and in earth" named after "the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." (Eph. iii. 14, 15.) It is separate from, and antagonistic to, that other kingdom of which "the god of this world" is the king. It is called, indifferently, the kingdom of heaven and the kingdom of God. Mr. Campbell says ("Chris. Sys.," p. 151): "But most evidently the kingdom of heaven is '*the kingdom of Christ and of God*' (Eph. v. 5). It is the kingdom of God, because he set it up (Dan. ii. 44), gave the constitution and King, and all the materials out of which it is erected (Jer. xxxi. 31–34). It is the kingdom of Christ, because God the Father gave it to him as his Son, and as the

Heir of all things; and, therefore, 'All that is the Father's is mine,' says Jesus, 'and I am his' (John xvii. 18); '*God created all things* BY *Jesus Christ and* FOR *him.*'"

This kingdom, or Church, "is of such;" that is, it is made up, composed, or constituted, "of such." The "of such" are, by the decree of Jesus, members—constitutional members. They are in it by necessity of its constitution. This point is so obvious that no attempt is made to deny it. Does not, then, this passage settle at once the question of infant membership in the Christian Church? O no, simple inquirer! We are told that Jesus was not talking of infants at all. "There are in these passages themselves evident indications that they were not babes—perfect infants: 'Suffer little children to *come* to me.' He does not say, *Carry* them to me; but, Let them *come*. Again, in Mark and Luke, he says, 'Suffer *the little children* to *come* to me.' They were, then, capable of hearing, learning, and coming to him. Yet he does not say, 'Of *them* is the kingdom of heaven;' but, 'Of such'—of those as humble, docile, and ingenuous as they—of *such* is the kingdom of God. Abraham, and Moses, and David, the prophets and apostles, are in character and spirit as teachable and subordinate as babes—and so are the children of God." ("Campbell on Baptism," p. 381.)

In Mr. Campbell's New Testament he renders Mark x. 13: "Then they brought children to him, that he might touch them; but his disciples rebuked those that brought them." In Luke xviii. 15, he properly reads "babes." Here the inspired writings say they were *babes—perfect infants;* that

these babes were *brought*, and that those who brought them were rebuked by the disciples—the apostles—for bringing these babes. Mr. Campbell evidently saw that this attack upon the correctness of the record was hopeless. Hence he shifts his ground, and says Jesus was not talking "of them," although "they were capable of hearing, learning, and coming to him." O no, he was talking of Abraham, Moses, David, the prophets and apostles! His paraphrase would be, "Suffer those who are capable of hearing, learning, and coming to me, to come; for the kingdom of God is composed of Abraham, Moses, David, the prophets, and the apostles!" Such is the outrage upon the integrity of the Holy Scriptures, that is necessary to becloud the simple teaching of Jesus on this interesting topic.

The ultra caution of many, who are disposed to read these passages aright, leads them to a partial concession that, perhaps, our Lord meant to say that the kingdom is constituted of persons of child-like disposition. But where is the necessity of this? Jesus knew the force of words; and was quite capable of saying, when needful, "Except ye be converted, and *become as little children*, ye shall not *enter into* the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. xviii. 3.) But here he said no such thing. His language is, "*Of such is* the kingdom of heaven."

There is another fact that seems constantly to be overlooked in studying this history. The parents were not addressed by Jesus at all. They came, bringing their children. The children did not come—they were brought. The apostles did not rebuke the children for coming, but the parents for

bringing their babes. The rebuke and instruction of the Lord was addressed not to the parents, but to the apostles. Before this "the keys of the kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xvi. 19) had been given to these same apostles. Jesus had said to them, "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." (Matt. xviii. 18.) Afterward this grant is further explained thus: "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." (John xx. 23.) This grant of the power of the keys authorized them to fix the terms of admission into the door: to say who should come in—determine who might be recognized as members. In the case under consideration, however, Jesus settles the one point of infant relationship. He, in the most precise and emphatic manner, removes that question beyond their jurisdiction. The apostles are here allowed no discretion. Here are parties that by virtue of its constitution are in the kingdom. "Of such is the kingdom of God." Therefore, you apostles—keepers of the keys—shall *not forbid*, but "suffer little children to come unto me." The privileges you must—you shall—accord to them, and that without any hinderance whatsoever, for the sole reason that "of such is the kingdom."

Alford, on Mark x. 14, says: "We can hardly read our Lord's solemn saying without seeing that it reaches farther than the mere present occasion. It might one day become a question whether the Christian covenant of repentance and faith could take in the unconscious infant, as the old covenant

did—whether, when Jesus was no longer on earth, little children might be brought to him, dedicated to his service, and made partakers of his blessing. Nay, in the pride of human intellect, this question was sure one day to be raised; and our Lord furnishes the Church, by anticipation, with an answer to it for all ages. Not only may little infants be brought to him, but, in order for us to come to him, we must cast away all that wherein our maturity has caused us to differ from them, and *become like* THEM. Not only is infant baptism *justified*, but it is (abstractedly considered, not as to the *preparation* for it, which, from the nature of the case, must be exceptional) the NORMAL PATTERN OF ALL BAPTISM; none can enter God's kingdom except *as an infant*. In adult baptism, the *exceptional case* (see above), we strive to secure that state of simplicity and childlikeness which in the infant we have ready and undoubted to our hands."

Having thus found the place of infants in the Church of God, and the specific grant of privilege as such, the question of their baptism is settled as a matter of course. If baptism is a privilege, then it is theirs by necessity of relationship; if a duty, then by the same necessity it is their duty. Jesus has settled the matter.

Mark ix. 36, 37 (see also Matt. xviii. 1–6; Luke ix. 46, 47, 48): "And he took a child and set him in the midst of them: and when he had taken him in his arms, he said unto them, Whosoever shall receive one of such children in my name, receiveth me; and whosoever shall receive me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me."

The same lesson is here taught as that in the other case—of children brought to Christ; that is, that the child is a member, a model member, of Christ's Church; that one who recognizes the child as such does thereby recognize Christ in his relation both to God and to man. The word "receive" implies just such an acknowledgment in this first clause as it does in the other. As you receive—that is, acknowledge—this child, so you receive, acknowledge, Christ and him who sent him.

"In my name, *epi to onomati mou*. Figuratively, *epi* denotes in general the foundation *on* which an action, or state, rests. (Phil. iii. 9.) So in Matt. iv. 4. *Zen ep' arto*, Sept. (corresponding to *en rhemati*), after the Hebrew *chayah al*, Deut. viii. 3 (though it is thus used in Greek authors, Plato, Alcib. 1. 105; Alciph. 3. 7, of *sustentare vitam*). Here belongs, also, *epi to onomati tinos*, to do something *upon* the name of some one—*i. e.*, in doing it to rely upon, or have reference to, the name of some one. The expression has various applications in the New Testament: *Epi to onomati Ies. Chr.*, to teach *upon* (in) *the name of Christ* (Luke xxiv. 47; Acts iv. 17; v. 28, 40)—*i. e.*, by referring to him as the source of doctrine and authority; *to cast out demons upon* (in) the name of Christ (Luke ix. 49)—*i. e.*, making the efficacy of the exorcising depend on his name (uttered on the occasion as a solemn form); *baptism upon* (in) *the name of Christ*, is baptism founded on the acknowledgment of his name (Acts ii. 38); *to receive upon* (in) *the name of Christ* (Matt. xviii. 5)—*i. e.*, because he bears his name, confesses him, etc." (Winer, Gr. Gram., 392.)

The reeeiving has reference to the child's relations to Christ, and hence Christ is honored by such a reception.

The disciples were maneuvering for positions in the new government which they supposed was about to be established. Jesus, to rebuke their worldly-mindedness, calls up this ehild to illustrate the true eharaeter of citizens and most honorable members of its body politic. He thereby shows that their departure from child-likeness was a departure from the kingdom; that they must return to this model charaeter, or advaneement was an impossibility. The ehild, yet ignorant of the developments of worldly life, is the true model, and hence is by foree of relation to Christ a member of the kingdom, or Church.

While the Bible thus aecurately and fully defines the *status* of children in their relation to the Church, it does not leave us to grope as to any important item of privilege or duty. It teaches the doctrine of infant baptism by *specific precept*, by *example* given, as well as necessary *deduction*. It is true that multitudes of Pedobaptist writers have ineautiously admitted that there is no specific warrant for it; but the eandid reader will see that they mean only that they eannot meet the demand for the word *infant* associated with the word *baptize*. Such a demand is absurd; it is an attempt to dictate to God the terms in whieh he shall make his revelation. The fact that these men taught and practiced infant baptism demonstrated that they believed the Bible authorized and taught this doetrine. The so-ealled

concessions amount to no more than an acknowledgment, or declaration, that the demand of the opposers of this doctrine were unreasonable. I hold that the New Testament gives a specific warrant, or precept, and that in this I am not really taking new ground.

First, by precept. Legitimately, a candid inquirer would first begin with the law regulating the terms of membership, as defined in the original constitutional enactments on this subject; but as the opponents of this God-given grant have been compelled, in defense of their existence, to attempt to invalidate that appeal, by attacking the Old Testament Scriptures as at present authoritative, I begin with that which some of them do absurdly pretend is the beginning of God's Church, and all of them *graciously* admit to be authoritative.

In Matt. xxviii. 18, 19, 20: "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations [*panta ta ethnee*], baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen." In this we have but one imperative. The instruction is, Having gone, disciple the nations—the Gentiles—baptizing and teaching them. The specific injunction is "to disciple." The attendant circumstances are the "having gone," the "baptizing," and the "teaching." Hence, the important word is that translated "teach." The Baptist New Testament has it "disciple;" Mr. Anderson

has "make disciples;" Mr. Campbell has "convert," in his New Testament and "Christian System;" in his "Baptism" he has "make disciples." In this last-named work, he says, page 220: "According to the common version of this law of baptism, Jesus taught the apostles first to *teach all nations*, then to baptize them; and, again, to *teach them all his observances.* The common reader would regard this as simply requiring that the nations be *taught* before and after baptism! But in the original language we have not this difficulty to contend with. We have two words of very different meaning occurring in the same verse, translated by one and the same word, *teach.* These are *matheteuoo* and *didascoo.* They are visibly and audibly different words. They are not composed of the same characters, nor of the same sounds. They are just as different in sense."

This "commission" is an appointment in fulfillment of THE PROMISE of THE COVENANT, Gen. xii. 3): "And in thee shall all families [*phulai*—tribes] of the earth be blessed." Peter quotes it as "*the covenant,*" in Acts iii. 25: "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds [*patriai*—families] of the earth be blessed." Paul quotes it as the gospel of salvation to the Gentiles, preached to Abraham, Gal. iii. 8: "And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen [*ethnee*] through faith, preached before the gospel unto Araham, saying, In thee shall all nations [*panta ta ethnee*] be blessed." In this last we have the exact words of the commission, which is itself an exact quotation from Gen.

xviii. 18: "Seeing that Abraham . . and all the nations [*panta ta ethnee*] of the earth shall be blessed in him." The same words, also, are used in Gen. xxii. 18 and xxvi. 4. The salvation promised in the Christian covenant was to be published according to the terms of the great original promise of the Abrahamic covenant. They are not two, but one. This is *the promise* of Abraham given to the "nations"—that is, the Gentiles.

On a previous occasion of sending out the twelve to preach, Jesus said, Matt. x. 5, 6: "Go not into the way of the Gentiles [*ethnee*], and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Such had been the rule heretofore. Now, however, the fullness of the promise was to be given. Hence, we have, "Go, disciple all nations [*panta ta ethnee*]." From which it is obvious that the *ethnee*—nations, or Gentiles—is put in contrast with "the house of Israel," "the children of the covenant." To these "children of the covenant" this gospel had been constantly preached—by the Scriptures, by the "school-master" rites and ceremonials, and by the prophets. The rites had been theirs all the while. The commission does not send the apostles to these children of the covenant, but to the *ethnee*—to those who, prior to this time, had been secluded by "the wall of separation," the "commandments contained in ordinances."

By rendering "*panta ta ethnee*" "all nations" this idea is somewhat obscured to us. The Jew understood it to mean the Gentiles. This word *ethnee*—the plural of *ethnos*—carries, in Scripture,

the specific idea of "the Gentiles," as distinguished from the Jews. Acts xxvi. 20, 23: "But shewed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles [*ethnee*], that they should repent and turn to God." "That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should shew light unto the people, and to the Gentiles [*ethnee*]." Rom. iii. 29: "Is he the God of the Jews only? is he not also of the Gentiles [*ethnee*]? Yes, of the Gentiles [*ethnee*] also." Rom. ix. 24: "Even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles." See, also, Rom. xv. 8–12.

This brings out the first great change in the economy of the Church. The provisions of *the promise* are now to be offered to all for whom that promise was designed; this, too, without any of the previously-existing restrictions—so that we find here a removal of restriction, and that only. Paul learns from it that "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." (Gal. iii. 28.) All the restrictive distinctions are at an end; and thus the promise finds its fullness of completion.

Next, they were to baptize. Prior to this time, when one wished to avail himself of the benefits of "the seed of Abraham," he had to be circumcised. In this change we find nothing touching the proper subjects, except as expressed in the pronoun "*them*." Here are specified the subjects of the baptism to be administered. This pronoun has for

its antecedent the "all nations [*ethnee*]" of the former clause; so that whatever construction we may give to this antecedent necessarily attaches to this pronoun. If the "all nations" includes children, then, as a necessary consequence, the pronoun "them" includes children.

Mr. Anderson, at this point, manifests a disingenuousness for which I was not prepared. After the word "them" he puts this parenthesis: (the disciples). Such an amendment makes moderately good Campbellism; and if Jesus had been teaching Campbellism, he would, doubtless, have had it so arranged. But the scholarly Mr. Anderson is guilty of making a verb the antecedent to this personal pronoun! But it is urged that *ethnee* is neuter in gender, while the pronoun *autous* is masculine. Thereupon, Mr. Anderson assumes to mend the text of our Lord by the nonsensical arrangement, *disciple the disciples*. This is necessary by his construction. But what about this disagreement of gender? Listen to Greek grammarians:

Buttman, § 129. 11: "The grammatical accord between the subject and predicate is further disturbed: (*a*) When, with a *collective* noun in the *singular*, the predicate is put in the *plural*. (*b*) When the predicate follows not the grammatical, but the *natural*, gender of the subject. These instances form what is called *constructio ad sensum v. kata sunesin*—an important feature of the Greek syntax, which applies, also, to other portions of it, and especially to relative and participial clauses."

Kühner, § 241. 1: "The form of the predicate, in many cases, does not agree with the subject gram-

matically, but in sense only (*constructio kata sunesin*). Hence, after a collective noun in the singular, when it is used of persons, as well as after the names of cities and countries, used for the *inhabitants*, and also with abstracts which stand for concretes, the *plural* is used, and such *gender* as belongs to the persons denoted by these words."

He says, further: "With attributive adjectives this construction is rare, and only poetic, but is very common in prose with a part which stands in remoter attributive relation. . . . It is very frequent with the pronouns."

Stuart, § 120: (1) "It is a general law respecting pronouns of every kind, that they should conform, as to *gender*, to the noun which is their correlate. But concord in this respect is often merely *ad sensum*—*e. g.*, 'Teach *panta ta ethnee*, baptizing *autous*,' masculine pronoun, because *ethnee* designates *men*. Mat. xxviii. 19."

Winer, 7th edition (141): "It is a peculiarity common to pronouns, whether personal, demonstrative, or relative, that they not unfrequently take a different gender from that of the nouns to which they refer, regard being had to the *meaning* of the nouns, not to their grammatical sex (*constructio ad sensum*). This happens especially when an *animate* object is denoted by a neuter substantive or a feminine abstract; the pronoun is then made to agree grammatically with the sex of the object in question, either masculine or feminine, as Matt. xxviii. 19."

The *third* point is "teaching." This is to follow the baptism. In reference to the import of this

there is no diversity of opinion; nor does it present any new phase, differing from the old Abrahamic practice.

Now, we may begin to make our conclusions affecting the point of inquiry. Whom were the apostles to baptize? The answer is given by the Lord himself. He says, "All nations"—the Gentiles. Does this include infants? In other words, Are there any infants among the Gentiles? The question is too simple for discussion; but if found among the Gentiles, then, also, in the "them"—the object of the participle "baptizing." I hardly have patience to notice the silly retort that "There are also thieves, murderers, drunkards, etc., in all the nations." As already shown, this commission is simply an extension of Abrahamic privileges to the subjects of the Abrahamic promise. While it is in the most positive and explicit manner said of infants, "Of such is the kingdom," it is quite as positively and explicitly said that this other class cannot see that kingdom. They, by their character, are excluded by legal enactments and decision of Jesus.

But, just here, we are met with the astounding discovery that the commission is not complete; that Jesus had to make another effort before he could get it to suit our immersion friends. The astute McGarvey says: "The items of which it is composed are not fully stated by either one of the historians, but must be collected from the partial statements of Matthew, Mark, and Luke." ("Com. on Acts," p. 10.) Luke is evidently mentioned simply as a make-weight. It is Mark xvi. 16 that they hope to use: "He that believeth and is bap-

tized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Leaving out of consideration the fact that many of the highest authorities reject these last verses of this book as spurious, yet, as this text does state the truth, its bearing may well be studied. How does it affect our question? Immersionists answer that it requires faith to precede baptism. But does it say so? Does it teach any thing on that point? It shows that one who believes and has been, and still is, baptized shall be saved; that one who does not believe shall be damned. It teaches the present state in which one must be found to be saved; that is, our final salvation, or damnation, is made to depend on the condition in which an individual is found at the last. If at that time he is a believer, living in the spirit of baptismal obligations, he is safe; but if in unbelief, he is lost. It says nothing, directly or by implication, as to what order had to be observed in coming into that condition—whether the faith or baptism was first—yet, he that now believeth and is baptized shall be saved. Even in the estimation of immersionists this text does not teach their position. If it did, then no dipping or other ceremony would be baptism, except to a believer. Yet if, as all admit possible, they immerse one who afterward they find was not a believer, they do not repeat the ceremony; they recognize the first as valid and sufficient. This they would not—they could not—do, if the Bible required the order that they here assume to be taught. In this text the one great important consideration in the salvation of men—faith—is dignified by special prominence. This, and no more.

To return to a direct consideration of the text specifying the duty of the apostles, I want to call in Mr. Campbell for his views. "Chr. Sys.," p. 198: "The commission for converting the world teaches that immersion was necessary to discipleship; for Jesus said, 'Convert the nations, immersing them into the name,' etc., 'and teaching them to observe,' etc. The construction of the sentence fairly indicates that no person can be a disciple, according to the commission, who had not been immersed: *for the active participle, in connection with an imperative, either declares the manner in which the imperative shall be obeyed or explains the meaning of the command.* To this I have not found an exception. For example: 'Cleanse the house, sweeping it;' 'cleanse the garment, washing it,' shows the manner in which the command is to be obeyed, or explains the meaning of it. Thus: 'Convert (or disciple) the nations, immersing [baptizing] them, and teaching them to observe,' etc., expresses the manner in which the command is to be obeyed." Four years after, Mr. Campbell issued a new edition of his book, and in a foot-note he says: "This rule has passed through a fiery ordeal. I have only been more thoroughly convinced of its generality and value."

Without expressing any judgment as to the value of his rule in general application, it is certain that the law of Greek grammar (not English syntax, as Mr. Campbell has it) justifies—nay, requires—such a construction in this case.

"As the participle is an *attributive*, and consequently expresses an action as already attached, or

belonging, to an object, only those verbs can take a participle for their complement which require, as a complement, an action, in the character of an *attribute*, so attaching, or belonging, to an object that this object appears in some action or state. The action, or state, denoted by the participle is, therefore, usually *prior* to that denoted by the verb with which it is connected, sometimes *coincident*." (Kühner, § 310. 1.)

Dr. Geo. Chr. Knapp, "Chr. Theo.," pp. 133,134: "Wherefore, he requires his disciples (verse 19) to go forth and proselyte all nations (*matheeteusate panta ta ethnee*). They were to do this in two ways —viz.: by baptizing (*baptizontes*), and by *instructing* (*didaskontes*)." Also, page 483: "They were to be made disciples of Christ, or professors of his religion (*matheeteuin*), in a twofold manner—viz.: by *baptism*, and by *instruction*. They were to be baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; *i. e.*, by baptism they were to be obligated to accept and obey the doctrine which acknowledges and receives Father, Son, and Holy Spirit."

To "disciple" here is equivalent to the expression of putting into school—enrolling as scholars by baptizing them, and then educating by subsequent "teaching" in all things which Christ commanded. "Here the Lord presents us with the idea of a Christian school in which the NATIONS are to be educated." This idea is so prominent and necessary that, forgetful of his theory, Dr. Hiscox, in his "Baptist Directory," page 77, note 2, says: "Persons on entering a Church may be ignorant of many things in Scripture doctrine, which they will after-

ward learn. Nor should they be rejected simply on that account. Indeed, they enter the Church as a school of Christ, to receive instruction."

There can be but the two ideas in this text: first, initiating, or rather entering, into the school of Christ; and then fulfilling the purpose of that entering by educating. The terms employed exclude, by force of their meaning, the idea of previous teaching as part of Christ's normal plan. But such baptism is only practicable in the case of infants; the baptism of adults is, by necessity of the case, exceptional—just as was the circumcision of adults in the earlier days of the Church. Then the law of circumcision was made for infants, and for infants exclusively. That was God's plan. They are mistaken who say, "It was a law of adult circumcision, but included infants." To those adults who were willing to become as little children a prior teaching was necessary. So also here. "Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." (Mark x. 15.) As the privilege is for infants, those who are not infants must become such in order to enjoy their privileges.

Hence the conclusion that God's plan is to "disciple"—*i. e.*, make disciples, by baptism as the first act, and then "teaching;" or, as Paul has it, "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." (Eph. vi. 4.) This was the universal rule now to be applied to "all nations"—*ta ethnee*—*i. e.*, the Gentiles. None can be received except those of whom "is the kingdom of heaven"—that is, infants, and those who become as little children

in order to their entrance into the kingdom of heaven.

The silly objection has been urged that infants are not mentioned. Please tell me who are named? Are men? Are women? Do not the terms restrict the rite to those who are afterward to be trained up in the Lord? A careful, honest study of this text shows it to be as explicit in its teaching as was its original form in the Abrahamic Church, before extended to embrace the Gentiles ["all nations"]. If adults have rights under this law, those rights are of an exceptional nature. As certainly as that baptism is to be offered to Gentiles ("all nations") by preachers of the gospel, so certainly are its provisions suited to, and designed for, those who, after baptism, are to be taught the laws of Christ. Infant baptism is enjoined; adult baptism is admissible. The "of such is the kingdom" of Jesus is here reiterated.

Secondly. This same doctrine is exemplified by apostolic practice. The apostles themselves followed prior examples as well as obeyed specific teaching.

1 Cor. x. 1, 2: "All our fathers were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." The entire nation was baptized. At the time of this passage through the sea there were six hundred thousand fighting men in the nation. Hence the estimate of three million of souls in the aggregate. Many of these were infants. Then were all baptized. Semi-infidels urge that if the unconscious babe was baptized by merely passing through the sea and under the cloud, then, also, were oxen, asses, etc. At times I have been tempted to admit that some of the

asses were, for it is only the progeny of such that would be likely to claim them as "fathers."

Heb. ix. 19, 20: "And sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you." Ex. xxiv. 8: "And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words." This was a sacramental service, reminding us of "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Matt. xxvi. 28.) But this ceremony of Moses was one of the divers baptisms of Heb. ix. 10. It was a national baptism similar to that at the Red Sea. In the nation at this time, as before, multitudes of infants were embraced in the covenant, and hence in the baptism then administered.

Acts xvi. 15, 33; 1 Cor. i. 1–16. These are cited as cases of family baptism. For brevity's sake I take the first—that of Lydia and family, Acts xvi. 14, 15: "And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshipped God, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there. And she constrained us."

Mr. Campbell here, as everywhere else, recklessly sacrifices God's word in the futile effort to support his rotten creed. He has it, "And when she was immersed, with her family, she entreated," etc.

This leaves it open to the construction that her family joined in the request, and not necessarily that they were baptized. The original utterly—nay, purposely—excludes that idea, by saying, "When she was baptized and [*kai*] her family, she entreated us."

The plain teaching of the passage is that Lydia, a householder, who worshiped God, heard the preaching. The Lord opened the heart of this hearer; and as a consequence *she*, and not her family, attended unto the things spoken. After her baptism she, and not the family, invited the preacher to abide in *her* house. The argument was *her own* faithfulness in the Lord, as exhibited by the baptism of herself and family. It is evident that here, as elsewhere, Paul taught the duty of parents to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; that, in the spirit of his commission, he showed her duty, as the head of the family, to have that family discipled by baptism and teaching. And Lydia attended unto the things spoken by Paul. The careful reader will have noticed that the baptism is spoken of incidentally. It is used to fix the time at which she made the request for the preachers to come into her house and abide. In the statement that "she attended to the things spoken by Paul," the instructed Bible-student will already have learned not only that she was baptized, but her family also, if she had a family. Hence the casual manner of referring to this matter-of-course incident.

Mr. Campbell's treatment of this case is as follows ("Baptism," pp. 227, 228): "Lydia, it is assumed,

was a married lady. It is assumed that she had children. It is also assumed that some of her children were infant children. It is also assumed that she had these infant children with her, although three hundred miles from home; for she was now at Philippi, her home being at Thyatira. On these four assumptions is the first argument for infant baptism drawn from the four Gospels and The Acts of the Apostles. Now, it being much more probable Lydia was an unmarried rather than a married lady, being a dealer in purple and ladies' apparel, having with her other females and servants on a journey from home, the chances are all against these four assumptions. What a hypothetical basis for a divine institution! Was there ever a positive ordinance founded upon such assumptions? But the internal evidences are still more fatal to the hypothesis; for she represents herself as a householder and the head of a family."

Mr. Campbell's position here has the unhappy fortune of being false in statement and inconsistent with itself. As a fact, no one of his four so-called assumptions is necessary to our argument. In the next place, it is false that she was "three hundred miles from home," as he himself shows in the last sentence quoted: "She represents herself as a householder and head of a family." Householder, where? In Thyatira? or Philippi? I shall have to *assume*, I suppose, that she lived at Philippi, and did not invite Paul to go to Thyatira for his bed and needs while preaching at Philippi. Further, I will *assume* that her family was with her, at least that day, as they were baptized with her. In fact,

every thing is fully admitted in that last sentence which is in anywise important to the true and full exposition of this Bible doctrine.

The opponents of this provision of God's scheme have felt that they could plant themselves behind the admitted fact that we are unable to prove the presence of babes in this family, and indulged in an unenviable spirit of jeering. But a moment's reflection will make it apparent that the presence of an infant, or even of minor children, is not absolutely essential to our conclusion on this subject. So far as the mere argument goes, I feel it not worth the trouble of a criticism to find children in this family. When the law of circumcision was given, although it was, as in this, restricted to children eight days old, yet it is wholly impossible to prove that any such children were circumcised at the time that Abraham attended unto the things spoken unto him on that subject. We know that Abraham was ninety-nine, and Ishmael thirteen, years old when he (Abraham) and his household were circumcised. (Gen. xvii. 23–27.) Shall we thereupon conclude that there were no infants? and hence the rite was not intended for children? What are the facts? Abraham believed God, and upon his faith he and his were inducted into covenant relations with God; Lydia believed God, and upon her faith she and her family were inducted into covenant relations with God.

But it is urged, *Perhaps* her family was composed of "females and servants on a journey from home." Nevertheless, she and her family were baptized on her faith. What! you ask, Grown up people bap-

tized upon the faith of some other person? But, my friend, that was your assumption, not mine; I simply take the record, which teaches that the family was baptized upon the faith of the head of the family. What is the law of infant Church-membership and, by consequence, of infant baptism? Is it that the babe shall come seeking? or not rather that the parent, or head of the family, shall bring it? Evidently, the duty is that of the parent, or head of the family. So long, then, as that head of the family exercises control over the family, the responsibility as to this duty lasts. But it is evident that Lydia exercised this control, for "she attended to the things spoken," and hence her family was baptized.

A case better calculated to exemplify this law of infant membership and its attendant, of infant baptism, can scarcely be imagined. Had this relationship been a new, unheard-of one, then while this case really covers all the conditions, yet we would require some greater fullness of detail; but, seeing that the writer, and those for whom he wrote, had been accustomed to this established relationship—that no one had ever called it in question—a more satisfactory presentation would be impossible, without what would have been a silly fullness of detail. The adult had to change her relation, but the children did not, for "of such is the kingdom." Lydia received the kingdom as they when she became prepared; they had no preparation to make.

Thirdly. Proof by necessary *inference* is as valuable as any other sort. The New Testament is full of such teaching. Gal. iii. 26–29: "For ye are

all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, *then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the* PROMISE." Here we have the statement that distinctions are obliterated; that the fact of being Christ's—*i.e.*, Christians—makes us all, Jew or Greek, male or female, Abraham's seed, and hence heirs of the Abrahamic covenant, *promise.* This covenant was restricted in its provisions to Abraham and his seed. Gal. iii. 16: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ."

In the 8th verse Paul quotes from Gen. xii. 3: "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Although this is the gospel of salvation to the heathen (*ethnee*—the nations), yet nothing is said of "the seed." It is only in what is popularly recognized as the covenant of circumcision that this cardinal idea is specified. Gen. xvii. 7: "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee *and thy seed* after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." It is obvious, then, that Paul speaks specifically of the covenant of circumcision, and *the promise* therein contained; so that it is in that covenant that our charter of rights is found.

"The promise," not covenant. A covenant is an agreement between parties; the promise is God's undertaking in this agreement with Abraham. This

depends upon the fulfillment of our agreement. As originally the "uncircumcised man child" had broken God's covenant, so now he who fails of doing that enjoined—that is, baptism—excludes himself. "To thee"—that is, to Abraham in his own person and behalf. "To thy seed"—not seeds, not descendants generally, but one particular person, or unity in that person, "which is Christ." This obviously does not mean Jesus, but those who are "in Christ," have put on Christ. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ." (1 Cor. xii. 12; Eph. i. 22, 23; iv. 12; v. 30.)

This relation to Christ is the exclusive ground in that covenant. "Neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God; but the children of THE PROMISE are counted for THE SEED." (Rom. ix. 7, 8.) "Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of *promise*." (Gal. iv. 28.) "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, . . that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles (*ethnee*—the nations) through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." (Gal. iii. 13, 14.)

In the same connection, Paul says: "The covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ (concerning Christ), the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, *cannot disannul, that it should make* THE PROMISE *of none effect*." (Gal. iii. 17.) Again: "That the Gentiles (*ethnee*—nations) should be *fel-*

low-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the gospel." (Eph. iii. 6.) Again: "Now I say that Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, *to confirm the promises* made unto the fathers." (Rom. xv. 8.)

From these it appears that Christ confirms the promises which the law did not annul; that all who are in Christ are heirs of that promise contained in the Abrahamic covenant—the covenant of circumcision; that the relation of Christ to that covenant is so intimate that our heirship to all spiritual blessings is heirship to the promise of that covenant. Hence the enjoyment of spiritual blessing depending on that covenant brings us under the operation of that covenant not only as to blessing, but also as to its obligations. In common with Jews, we Gentiles (*ethnee*) are fellow-heirs—heirs to the covenant privileges, and hence obligations. These obligations constitute our undertaking as the promise; the privileges are God's undertaking. But, by the terms of the covenant, infant children were required to assume these obligations. It was for them in such a sense as to be exclusive in statement of its terms. It was then, as now, that "of such is the kingdom of heaven." If adults were admitted, they had to come as infants, accept of the rite intended for infants, and thus become partakers with infants in the privileges of this covenant.

But as this is called the covenant of circumcision (Acts vii. 8), and it is agreed that the rite of circumcision is not now practiced, does it not show that the covenant enjoining it is abolished? The reply to this is that the form of the external rite was not

an essential feature of the covenant. In fact, circumcision of the flesh is a mere sign. Rom. iv. 11: "And he received *the sign* of circumcision." This sign was the external cutting, which we are accustomed to call by the name of that which it represented—that is, circumcision. But that is not circumcision; Paul expressly teaches: "Neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh." (Rom. ii. 28.) He then tells us "circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter." (Verse 29.) The same is the teaching of Col. ii. 11: "Ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." That is, by Christian circumcision. This circumcision he then calls a burial in baptism. Hence, further, the declaration to a Gentile Church which never had known this cutting of the flesh (Phil. iii. 3): "We are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." Paul evidently knows but one circumcision, that of the heart—just as he knows only one baptism (Eph. iv. 5), that of the spirit. There is an outward rite called baptism, as there is an outward rite called circumcision. But as this outer rite is a sign of the inner in one instance, so also in the other; as this inner work is called indifferently circumcision or baptism, so also the outer rite is one and the same in design and office, differing only in the non-essential feature of manner. Water baptism is now the outer sign of spiritual circumcision, as circumcision of the flesh was the outer sign of spiritual baptism to Abraham and his earlier descendants.

The substitution of the outer sign for the thing signified by it was the mistake of the ritualists of Paul's day; it is the mistake of Campbellism of to-day. In treating of this, Paul says (Phil. iii. 2): "Beware of the concision." He uses a word that occurs nowhere else in the Bible. The verb from which it is derived is used four times in the LXX., as follows: Speaking of the priests of Baal, in their contest with Elijah, it is said they "*cut themselves* after their manner with knives." (1 Kings xviii. 28.) In Lev. xxi. 5, God's people are interdicted from the heathenish practice in mourning for their dead: "Nor make any *cuttings*." In Isa. xv. 2, the backslidings of God's people are threatened: "Every beard (shall be) *cut off*." Hosea vii. 14: "They *rebel* (cut themselves off) against me."

Hence, we conclude that Paul uses that word to suggest that reliance upon this rite was a heathenish practice; that the rite itself thus became an offense. Gal. v. 2, 4: "If ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing." "Ye are fallen from grace." This accounts for the fact that immediately after the warning, "Beware of the *concision*," he makes the antithetical statement, "We are the *circumcision*, which worship God in spirit," etc., just as if we to-day, following this Pauline example, were to say, "Beware of the waterists, or the dipped, for we are the baptized who worship God in spirit," etc.

From all which it is obvious that, in all the changes which have occurred in the ritual, the covenant remained unimpaired. The promise is "not made of none effect;" we are still the seed of Abraham, and as such are still heirs, according to this glorious cov-

enant made with our father Abraham. This covenant made special, not to say exclusive, reference to infants. Look where we may, and the truth ever recurs: "Of such is the kingdom of heaven."

The preaching of the apostles, in executing "the great commission," would, of course, be consistent with the requirements of its conditions. We never hear them, as we do Antipedobaptists, preaching "believer's baptism"—a change of the term of membership—but the reverse. The first sermon after the baptism of the Holy Ghost, on the day of Pentecost, was preached by the Jew Peter to a Jewish audience. He says to them, in commenting upon an Old Testament text: "The promise is unto you, and to your children." (Acts ii. 39.) Without attempting to settle the meaning of "the promise" in his speech, it is simply obvious that the customary phraseology of the people was used. Certainly there is no intimation in that sermon and language of a radical change excluding children from the benefits of "the promise" and of the Church.

Next, we have in Acts iii. 19: "Repent and be converted." Peter had heard Jesus say: "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Either Peter used the word in the same sense that Jesus did, or in some other. If in the same, then the idea "of such is the kingdom" is present. In the same sermon, verses 25, 26, Peter says: "Ye are the children of the prophets, and *of the covenant* which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. Unto you first God, having

raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." What an admirable opening to tell them that the covenant was superseded, and that they must turn away from it! But no, there is nothing of the sort; their being "children of the covenant" procured them the blessing; they were to be turned away from iniquities, but not from their glorious covenant.

Acts x.: Cornelius the centurion was "a devout man, and one that feared God with all his house." (Verse 2.) He "fasted, prayed, and gave alms." (Verses 30, 31.) Evidently he was a proselyte of the gate, who had acquaintance with God's law as revealed to the Jews. The lesson that Peter learned and preached was that "God is no respecter of persons." (Verses 15, 28, 34, 35, 37; chap. xi. 9, 17, 18.) He did not teach Cornelius that a new Church and a new law had been brought in, but that the old distinction as to privilege had been done away; that advantages of the covenant were no longer restricted to the Jews. If, then, Cornelius had been instructed in God's law as known to the Jews, he would, of necessity, have concluded that all the rights and duties of a Jew were offered and accorded to him and "his house."

Acts xvi. 31: Here we have the first sermon preached to a heathen, ignorant of God's law and Church. In preaching to this heathen the apostle says: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, AND THY HOUSE." It is this whole doctrine in a sentence. Upon the faith of the head of the family the family became partakers of the gospel privileges; that is, the covenant promises.

No adverse construction is possible on this passage. Instructing an ignorant man—one who had need to be informed of his privileges—this item is introduced when giving the merest outline summary of the gospel of Christ. The question of the jailer did not call for, or involve, the point here introduced by the apostle. He, in distress as a convicted sinner, sought only the condition of pardon; but, as a faithful preacher, Paul would omit no important item. His Master had specially charged the preachers to "suffer, and forbid not, the children to come unto him." Paul is careful to discharge this duty faithfully, by inculcating the fundamental truth, "Of such is the kingdom." Its importance, in his estimation, is shown by the solicitude he manifests to have it, as an elemental truth, grafted into the mind of this seeker of religion.

1 Cor. vii. 14: " . else were your children unclean [*akatharta*—unpurified]; but now are they holy [*hagia*]." This word *hagia*, when applied to persons in the New Testament, is invariably translated "saints." Saints are those who compose God's kingdom. Under the exclusive rule of the earlier dispensation, such children were unclean. Marriage with heathens was interdicted. When this law was violated maledictions were pronounced on its violators. "In those days also saw I Jews that had married wives of Ashdod, of Ammon, and of Moab: and their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and could not speak in the Jews' language, but according to the language of each people. And I contended with them, and cursed them." (Neh. xiii. 23–25.) Ezra x. 3: "Now

therefore let us make a covenant with our God to put away all the wives, *and such as are born of them*, according to the counsel of my lord."

The history of these matters in their connection, as recorded in those books, illustrates this matter of Mosaic law. The same question came up in the Church at Corinth, and Paul, in the spirit of the covenant, with the restrictions removed, extends the privileges to the *ethnee*—the Gentiles—and decides that the children are *hagia*—holy—saints. The explication of this passage is impossible, except upon the theory of infant rights in the Church under the covenant. Jesus enables us to understand Paul by his decision, "Of such is the kingdom of God."

Eph. vi. 4: "And, ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up [*ektrephete*] in the nurture [*paideia*] and admonition [*nouthesia*] of the Lord." They are to be brought up—that is, nurtured—as a nurse does a babe; but this is to be done in a certain relationship to the Lord. Into this relationship they are either born or subsequently brought. Then, the father, finding his children in this relation to the Lord, is to keep and train them in it by the education indicated. If the child is born into this condition, then he is entitled to all the privileges and benefits of that relationship. He is, also, by necessity, subject to the accruing obligations. If not thus born into this state, then, before the education is begun, the parent must bring the child into this relationship. But Jesus has settled the question of relationship: "For of such is the kingdom of heaven." Then, a regimen is prescribed suitable to this relationship: nurture

of the Lord, and the discipline of the Lord, must, by the parent, be diligently administered to this member of Christ's kingdom.

Acts xxi. 21: "And they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake [*apostasian apo*] Moses, saying that they OUGHT NOT TO CIRCUMCISE THEIR CHILDREN, neither to walk after the customs."

When Paul had returned from his last grand missionary tour, a meeting of "all the elders," presided over by James, was held. (Verse 18.) This convocation appears to have been quite similar to the first grand council at Jerusalem. (Chap. xv.) To this council Paul reports "particularly" his work in his recent mission. (Verse 19.) Then "they," James, and all the elders, "said unto him, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are *all zealous of the law.*" (Verse 20.) The thousands who exclusively constituted the Church at Jerusalem were "all zealous of the law." They had been taught no better; although the apostles all, more or less, had labored there. "James and the elders" did not disparage them, because of their zeal for the law; neither did Paul. These zealous Jews were the ones who had been "informed" that Paul taught "that they ought not to circumcise children." These Jews thought that Paul was leaving out the children; that he was doing just what the Antipedobaptists do, and assert that Paul did. It was evident that the coming together of "these believing Jews" would elicit an outburst against Paul and this supposed heresy of his.

Either Paul did teach and practice, as these Jews were informed, and as Baptists and Campbellites teach and practice, or he did not so teach and practice. If he did teach as was charged against him, then we expect to see him, in his usually bold, candid manner, facing the wild beast of prejudice in the council and "the multitude," and declaring the gospel he preached. He ought now to have told them of the new Church, new terms of membership—that the old fleshly affair was exploded. What an admirable opportunity would this have been for some Baptist or Campbellite!

It is evident, however, that James, and all the elders, strangely enough, thought Paul was slandered; that these Jews were misinformed on the subject. Hence, they propose that Paul shall satisfy "the multitude," not by proving that children were left out—that we were under a new covenant, in which only believers were admitted—but that the charge was *false* and *slanderous*. "And *all* may *know* that those things, whereof they were informed of thee, are *nothing;* but that thou thyself *walkest orderly, and keepest the law.*" (Verse 24.)

Mr. McGarvey, a Campbellite commmentator on Acts, says (page 195): "This speech shows that James considered it slanderous to say that Paul taught the Jews not to circumcise their children; and Paul's ready consent to the proposition made to him shows that he agreed with James. Yet this occurred after he had written the Epistle to the Galatians, in which he says: 'If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.'"

Bloomfield, *in loc.*, says: "*Stoicheis phulassoon nomon*—'that thou livest in the habitual observance of the law;' *stochein*, . being used of habitual action."

To show how utterly contradictory to the Antipedobaptist theory this whole transaction is, I quote a few passages further from McGarvey: "This I confess to be the most difficult passage in The Acts to fully understand, and to reconcile with the teachings of Paul on the subject of the Mosaic law." (Page 258.) He meant, and ought to have said, that he could not reconcile this with Campbellite rendering of Paul. The fact is, it antagonizes them. "The truth is that, up to this time, Paul had written nothing which directly conflicted with the service of the altar, and he did not yet understand the subject correctly." (Page 260.)

Think of that! A Campbellite proclaimer saving his own system by charging the inspired apostle with ignorance, because he did not teach Campbellism! *Did not yet understand correctly* a subject of vital importance in the religion he was inspired to teach! The effrontery of Campbellism!—of what is it not capable? Hear him again: "Some years later . . . . . the Holy Spirit made him a more distinct revelation of truth upon the subject. . . After these developments he would not, for any earthly consideration, have repeated the transaction with the Nazarites." (*Idem.*) "Hence, the charge, as understood by those who preferred it, was false; and it was with the utmost propriety that Paul consented to disabuse their minds, though the means he adopted for that pur-

pose was improper." (Page 261.) Lexington has spoken. Let the world stand in awe!

Mr. McGarvey, finding that his miserable theory is incompetent to explain this transaction—in fact, is destroyed by a plain, common-sense construction—cuts the Gordian knot by charging Paul with inconsistency and ignorance: not Paul only, but "James and all the elders," who had advised this course—nay, even the Holy Spirit with having given such imperfect illumination as to lead Paul and the others astray. Such are the results of opposition to infant Church-membership when consistently followed out, though we do not always find such simplicity as is shown by McGarvey in struggling with confessed impossibilities.

The truth is that the Jews had heard that Paul, unlike James and the other apostles, was teaching just what our Baptist and Campbellite friends teach—just what they say Paul teaches. These "Jews, believers," became deeply anxious and disturbed by this supposed attack upon the rights of their children. It is evident that James did not try to lead them to better views on this subject—nor did Paul; but Paul, under the advice of "James and all the elders," adopted the most efficient plan of showing all the "Jews, believers," that they still held, with the Master, that "of such is the kingdom of God."

In verse 25 mention is made of an exception as to the Gentiles. This exception was made by the apostles, not by specific revelation, but only as a matter of apostolic determining: "We have written and concluded." Here reference is had to the first

grand council at Jerusalem, and reported in chap. xv. The point raised both in chap. xv. and xxi. was "apostasy from MOSES"—the obligation of the Levitical law. The decision reached was that the Gentiles [*ethnee*] should be admitted to Church-membership and covenant privileges without assuming the obligations of the Levitical law as to its ordinances and ceremonies.

Chap. xv. 1: "And certain men which came down from Judea taught the brethren, and said, Except ye be circumcised *after the manner of Moses*, ye cannot be saved." Verse 5: "Certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed [taught], saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, and to *command them to keep the law of Moses*." Verse 2: "Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them," then "they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about THIS question."

The discussion is exclusively between recognized believers. On the one hand is the Campbellite, contending that obedience to positive institutions is necessary to salvation; on the other, Paul and Barnabas, opposing ritualistic religion. The question is whether *Mosaic* circumcision, with its resultant obligation, was a condition of salvation, and, by consequence, a condition precedent to membership in the Church.

Verse 6: "The apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter." It is recognized as an open question. It certainly was not an open question as to whether this was a condi-

tion of pardon to sinners. The apostles would hardly have attempted to settle by their determination the conditions upon which God might forgive sins; but they could and were required to determine whether or not this was to be fixed as a condition of admission to Church-privileges. Such authority they had. "The power of the keys" had been given them. (Matt. xviii. 18; John xx. 23.) Under this grant of authority they determined and concluded the question with reference thereto. Verse 7: "And when there had been much disputing." There was division of sentiment among the apostles and elders. Jesus had not settled that question. (Matt. v. 17.) Then Peter showed that when the first Gentile converts were made, God (verse 9) "put no difference between us [the circumcision] and them [the uncircumcision], purifying their hearts by faith." God had recognized them even in their uncircumcision, as he had Abraham.

After further discussion and an examination of the Old Testament Scriptures, the conclusion of James was adopted (verses 19–21): "That we trouble not them, which from among the Gentiles [*ethnee*] are turned to God: but that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood. For Moses of old times hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day." Herein is a remitting and a retaining —a binding and a loosing; but it has reference exclusively to the Mosaic ritual. Hence we find that *Mosaic circumcision*, with its resultant obligation to

keep the law of Moses, was and is decreed unnecessary to the Gentiles. It is not interdicted to them. Nor were Jewish converts relieved, by this decree, of any existing obligation. Obviously, it was not a law of pardon, "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." (Rom. x. 4.)

This decision did not touch the question of Abrahamic circumcision, nor the obligation resulting from that circumcision; it was only that of Moses. Abrahamic circumcision antedated that of Moses by four hundred and thirty years. (Gal. iii. 17.) John vii. 22: "Moses, therefore, gave unto you circumcision (not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers)." Even McGarvey, in the blindness of extreme sectarianism, could not avoid seeing this (p. 193): "We observe, first, that in the language of Jesus circumcision 'is not of Moses, but of the fathers.' The obligation which the Jews were under to observe it was not originated of Moses or the covenant of Mt. Sinai, but existed independent of that covenant and the law, having originated four hundred and thirty years before the law. The connection between the law and circumcision originated in the fact that the law was given to a part of the circumcised descendants of Abraham. . . Since, then, the law did not originate the obligation to be circumcised, the abrogation of the law could not possibly annul that obligation. We shall be forced, therefore, to the conclusion that it still continues since the law, unless we find it annulled by the apostles."

Abrahamic circumcision not being under discussion, we of course have no decision thereupon. It was merely a sign—a sign of that which God did, of

that which Christ does. Rom. iv. 11: "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had." Having this righteousness, procured by the death of Christ, he was entitled to the seal which consisted of an outward sign of an inward work of grace. Rom. xi. 28, 29: " . Neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh; but . . circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit," and not in the letter. Hence Paul writes, Phil. iii. 3: "We are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit."

Afterward "the law was added" to this glorious Abrahamic covenant. (Gal. iii. 19.) Its office was that of a school-master to bring us to Christ. (Gal. iii. 24.) This *addendum* was removed after the completion of its purpose. (Eph. ii. 15.) The commandments contained in ordinances, external rites and ceremonies—which had been added—were taken away.

But the relation of children to God's covenant was not originated or modified in or by the law. These rights are provided for in the Abrahamic covenant—that is, the covenant of circumcision. These rights had not been attacked by Paul. The Jews thought he had attacked them, and hence, as "believers," they naturally and religiously defend them. Paul, under advice of James and all the elders, recognizes the necessity of most promptly and efficaciously disabusing their minds, and of relieving himself of the slanderous charge.

The whole transaction shows how deeply the Church was stirred when they thought that their children were to be excluded by Antipedobaptist

teaching; and when the occasion of all others had been given Paul for quieting forever the question, how readily he and all the apostles did that very thing! As Jesus by words, before this, so now Paul by the most marked conduct, proclaims the everlasting truth, OF SUCH IS THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN!

A simple review of the points made, and I have done. This does not assume to be an exhaustive presentation of even New Testament teaching, but a grouping together of some few leading ideas. We have seen:

First. That by the most emphatic decree of Jesus Christ—the great Head and only Lawgiver of the Church—the children, infants, are in the Church; the relationship previously fixed and announced is to be maintained; that the apostles themselves were interdicted from intermeddling with it.

Second. That adults who are out of the Church form an exceptional class; that they can be admitted only by a spiritual return to the condition of "*babes* in Christ." They must receive the kingdom "as little children."

Third. That the statutory enactment regulating the administration of water baptism is, in its terms, by necessary construction, applicable to infants; that primarily it is applicable only to infants.

Fourth. That the apostles practiced infant baptism.

Fifth. That all our spiritual rights, benefits, and privileges, are derived from our heirship to the Abrahamic covenant; hence its unqualified obligations and requirements are on us.

Sixth. The preaching of the apostles shows that infant Church-membership is assumed as a fundamental condition—a condition well understood and universally recognized in the Church.

Seventh. That the Church was scandalized and outraged at the thought that Paul had been teaching, as Baptists and Campbellites teach, that the children were excluded.

Hence the conclusion that those who oppose this oppose God's plan of constituting the Church and saving the world. They assume an attitude that renders the conversion of the world an impossibility. The Bible plan proposes having children brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; they propose to have them brought up outside the Church: so that there must always be a class between—out of the Church, and waiting for conversion. In short, there are but these so-called Churches and hell where no infants are found. In God's family "in heaven and in earth" they find a home and a welcome. God loves them, and welcomes them to all the privileges he has to bestow.

THE CROSS OF CHRIST.

BY THE REV JOSEPH W MITCHELL, A.M.

"God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ."—Gal. vi. 14.

WE admire no characteristic of the great and gifted Apostle to the Gentiles more than his independency—his bold, outspoken utterances and fearless heroism. When duty demanded that he should take a position, he did not stop to inquire if expediency would dictate such a course—if it would be popular: his only question was, "Is it right?"

While in the interest of Judaism, a Pharisee of the straitest sect, no injury that he could inflict upon the infant Church of Christ was esteemed too great. He persistently and vindictively persecuted the saints "even unto strange cities;" and when God brought him out into the broad daylight of gospel truth, he conferred not with flesh and blood, ease and comfort, but at once, yielding up both, he gave to the cross his labors and his life. The interests of heaven ever determined his position, and unfaltering fidelity gave grandeur to his character. At Antioch, where the disciples were first called Christians, we find him withstanding Peter to the face—reproving him for his fear of man and shameful dissimulation. A beautiful consistency marked every movement, and an unaffected sincerity prompted

every action. Had indecision and compromise characterized his course, infinite evil must inevitably have resulted to the cause of Christianity. Just such a spirit was required to meet the exigences of the infant Church, and bear the story of the cross to the then great centers of the civilized world.

Shortly after the introduction of the gospel into Galatia by St. Paul, Judaizing teachers from Palestine went thither insisting upon the necessity of circumcision in order to secure the privileges and immunities flowing out from the Abrahamic covenant. By falsehood and detraction they succeeded in alienating many from their father in the faith, and from the beautiful simplicity of the gospel which he preached. These proselyting ritualists, "desiring to make a fair show in the flesh," induced numbers thus alienated, and anxious to avoid the odium of being supposed to trust in a *crucified* Christ for salvation, to unite with their party and submit to this carnal ordinance. By this act they would escape persecution and be regarded as members of the popular Church. These seem to have been their prompting motives. A desire to be popular with everybody, at the expense of one's own conscientious convictions, has, in many instances, led to sad and fearful compromises of Christian character. I know of no more effectual method of destroying individual influence, losing caste in a community, and ultimately forfeiting one's own self-respect, than by thus attempting to live a false life. To be Christ's disciples we cannot go with the multitude; we must dare to do right, and be true to our convictions. We may not float with the popular current

simply because it is easier and more agreeable—because it requires less self-denial; we must throw our influence against the stream of evil, and thus endeavor to check and restrain it.

The words of our text furnish a striking illustration of St. Paul's readiness to resist an innovation and expose an error, and his boldness to proclaim and defend a truth regardless of the favor or frowns of men. Judaizing teachers were boasting of their proselytes — those proselyted were congratulating themselves upon their easy escape from Jewish persecution, and whatever of ignominy might attach to the followers of a crucified Saviour. This state of things existing in Galatia induced the apostle to address them this letter. Its principal object was to show that the doctrine of these corrupting teachers destroyed the very essence of Christianity; that it reduced it from an inward spiritual life to an outward ceremonial system. Having laid bare the real design of his maligners and traducers, and exposed the imposition they would practice upon the people, he held up the cross as the center of healing and the source of power. Recognizing it as the symbol of salvation and the ensign of ultimate victory, he rose above all questions of expediency and compromise, and insisted upon its acceptance as the world's only hope and the grand condition of eternal life. He understood the nature and design of the atonement. He saw that it behooved Christ to suffer, and that without the shedding of blood there was no remission. He knew that the religion of Heaven was not wrapped up in any ceremony, form, ordinance, rite, or sacrament. He saw that every type, sign, and

symbol known to Mosaic law was but a finger-board, along the track of the centuries, pointing to the cross; and that every prophecy, prediction, and promise of Old Testament Scripture found its fulfillment and accomplishment there. He knew, from personal experience, that the gospel of Christ, as viewed in the light of the cross, was "the power of God unto salvation;" that nothing less than a thorough and complete change of heart, and a real, radical reformation of life, could satisfy the cravings of an immortal soul, and assimilate man to his Maker. He saw that "by the deeds of the law no flesh should be justified" in the sight of God, "but by *faith*, without the deeds of the law." "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ," he saw that all centralized in the cross; and that from it came the only remedy for the dreadful malady of sin—the only power that could arouse the slumbering millions of earth, and destroy the dominions of death and hell.

Understanding, as St. Paul did, that the law was simply a school-master, leading lost humanity to the cross—that religion was a vital force, appealing to man's highest reason, quickening his deepest consciousness, lifting him up into higher connections, and surrounding him with grander associations—he determined that Christ crucified should constitute his highest knowledge, the cross his greatest glory. He saw that it was destined to dethrone every idol, subvert every false faith, and in its onward march subdue every kingdom and continent to Christ; that its light would kindle upon every land, and its

royal wealth of divine mercy roll through every latitude, until, in its sublime sweep, it became as extensive as the world and as permanent as time! Thus viewing the cross, gathering about it a divine beauty, significance, and power, while his soul thrilled with its quickening inspiration, he uttered the sublime sentiment contained in our text: "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." It is as though he had said, "Circumcision cannot possibly do you any good; it will only make you a debtor to keep that law, from the thralldom of which Christ came to release you: 'Ye are not under law, but under grace.' Circumcision is simply an incidental appendage, indicating your relation to God's visible Church, and so likewise is its substitute—baptism—with which I have nothing to do; for 'Christ sent me not to baptize.' Succession is a broken reed—a chain, many of whose connecting links are lost, and will avail you nothing. Ritualism is a flimsy robe, and cannot conceal the poverty of your soul and the emptiness of your profession. To assume that these things can secure your future happiness is utter folly. All these are nothing: *a new heart and a new life are every thing;* and Christ, by his death on the cross, has rendered them attainable by every man—brought them within the reach of every human being."

The cross sends up through all the ages of the past a divine power, imparting virtue and efficacy to every sacrificial offering made to God in faith, lifting the soul into communion with its Author, and, in its wide range, reaching and embracing

every continent and child of earth. We should, therefore, glory in the cross, not only because it presents us with the sublimest manifestation of *love* marking the onward roll of nearly six thousand years, but also on account of its *universality*. Under the grand provisions of gospel economy the salvation of every human being is rendered possible. "Whosoever will, let him come," is the royal invitation, and the only limit. Man's salvation is made to depend upon his own voluntary act. *He elects himself to heaven or to hell.* "Choose you this day whom you will serve." "I set before you this day life and death, good and evil." Upon our own voluntary choice rests our weal or woe, our salvation or perdition. "It is God that worketh in us to will;" and upon the action of the will heaven and hell are suspended.

Those who will, of every caste, color, country, and clime, may come to God through Christ, and obtain everlasting life. Those immortal words of the Son of God, while yet on the cross—"It is finished"—like a thunderbolt scattered the partition walls of ten thousand distinctions. All barriers are swept away by the outflowing tide of God's love, like ridges of sand before a surging flood. This divine love rises above all heights, and spreads as wide as human want. Salvation is provided for all who will have it, without money or price, exception or limitation of any sort whatever! We should glory in the cross, not as beheld glittering in the crown of royalty, not as seen flaming upon the banner or flashing from the shield of armies contending for earthly conquest and dominion, not as beheld

gleaming on papal miters or ecclesiastical spires, not as paraded merely as an ornament, not as the insignia of wealth, the badge of distinction, or symbol of power, but on account of its redeeming, elevating, saving, and sanctifying influences. We should glory in the cross, *on account of its direct influence upon the human heart.* It gives birth to new desires, implants new principles, inspires new hopes, imparts tone and strength to all the finer sensibilities, and ennobles every faculty and power of our complex being. We go to a man steeped in sin and scarred by crime, remind him of his lofty birth, and the grand destiny awaiting him above; remind him of the fact that he was created in the image of God, quickened by the inbreathing of the Almighty, and chartered for eternity; we tell him of Christ and his love, and point him to the cross; he, prodigal as he is, comes to himself, begins to reflect, surveys his surroundings, sees his condition, realizes his utter destitution and shame, and the dreadful doom to which his course must inevitably lead him; he resolves to retrace his steps, sincerely repents, arises, throws the mighty arms of a living faith around the cross—light breaks in upon his smitten soul, peace and joy fill his bosom, and the glory of his God shines about him! O what a change the religion of the cross has wrought upon that heart, and made manifest in that life! He addresses himself at once to the vast work so invitingly opening up before him; every duty becomes a delight, and every work a worship; fortune smiles again; happiness returns to a desolate home; he builds up a bright and beautiful character; and ex-

erts an influence for good upon those around him that shall roll on and on forever.

The same beneficial results accruing to the individual give color and caste, position and prestige, to communities and counties, states and nations. Wherever the religion of the cross is the great governing and controlling principle, giving spring and force to conduct and character, the fine arts flourish, commerce is stimulated, and all the great arteries along which the national life-current is propelled evince health and thrift; peace sheds down upon the people her holy and benign blessings; prosperity waves her magic wand, and earth, and air, and ocean, combine to gladden and cheer the heart of man. We cannot engage in any enterprise, or occupy any position, where the religion of the cross will not enhance our true interests and adorn our character. At home its gentle and restraining influences are most sensibly felt, binding each to other, and all to God; chastening affection, blessing and beautifying every relationship, purifying every pleasure, and sanctifying every sorrow. In society it possesses the magic of the magnet, and draws around us the pure and good. It infuses new life into trade by inspiring greater confidence in our fellow-men; by inculcating honesty, morality, and the higher principle of Christian love; by breaking down and destroying a morbid desire for ill-gotten gain, and authoritatively teaching and enforcing the great principle embodied in the Golden Rule. It dignifies and ennobles every honorable profession by imparting its sublime spirit to every utterance, and divine strength to every action. It is the guar-

dian and conservator of both conduct and character, and these lie at the very base of all true success in every vocation of life. It gives to legislative enactments their strength and support, and to governments their value and duration.

Just in proportion as the cross is lifted up in the individual heart, in the Church and in the State, will its light and life-giving power shine forth, support, and save; exalted in the individual heart, it binds man to his fellow-being, and makes him akin to all heaven; take it down, and you curtain his future with midnight, and sunder every tie uniting him to his God. Shining as the candle of the Lord in the Church, and the very gates of hell cannot prevail against it. Remove the cross from its exalted position in the Church, and God raises up a Luther, and a reformation is the result; depress and obscure it by ritualism, and God breathes upon the Wesleys, and Methodism leaps into life; deep down in the national heart plant the cross, and from the shadows of Druid Britain emerge the splendors of Christian England; close the Bible to the masses, and, instead of in the heart, plant the cross upon the house-top, and over Ireland, the "emerald gem of the sea," settle down the shades of almost pagan night; lift high the cross and give the Bible to the people, and every rocky crag and sterile knob of Scotland kindles with the light and luster of noon! Its exaltation gives peace and greatness to Germany, while its depression sends blight and gloom to the millions of France.

It is thus, then, that we are to view the cross and estimate its value. We glory in the cross on ac-

count of both its negative and positive relations: it saves us from death—certain, remediless, fearful, eternal—and secures to us blessings immeasurable and incalculable; it widens our influence and enlarges our sphere of activity; it wakes up the latent powers of the soul, and gives us brighter views of life and our relations to the world; it unifies humanity, draws us together, and centralizes our interests. It achieves for the world its grandest victories, revolutionizes communities and kingdoms, and sublimes human character; it is the avowed foe to vice and sin in every form, and the unfailing friend to virtue and purity; it rescues from central ruin and exalts to heaven.

O the matchless power of the cross, transforming night into day, and death into life! It is the embodiment of all that is ennobling and enduring, and the soul of all that is sublime! Its glory will never diminish, nor its story cease to charm, so long as there is human want and human woe. So long as there shall remain earthly suffering and earthly sorrow, the cross will render its relief and supply its solace; so long as clouds shall gather and skies grow dark, the cross will shed its light and illumine our way; so long as the wintry winds of adversity shall sweep the soul, and sadness chill the very fountains of affection, the cross will calm the troubled bosom and render the temple of life radiant with the light of heaven; so long as sin shall smite, the cross will extract its deadly virus; so long as grief shall gather in aching hearts, the cross will soothe, and comfort, and cheer. The cross will never cease to be the chief glory of the good and

great, nor its story grow old, while along the highways of crime the angel of death sows the seeds of ruin; while the noxious weeds of depravity and shame blossom and yield their dreadful harvest. It will never grow old while hope shall kindle on the brow of the future, and faith, fueled at the altars of her God, shall feed her eternal fires; so long as love shall lend her light and unveil her treasures; so long as visions bright, beautiful, and immortal shall gild the closing hours of life's eventful day, and God, giving us dying grace, shall enable every trusting child to attest its power. We will glory in the cross so long as it continues to pour a flood-tide of rich and rosy light athwart the gathering shades and gloom of death; so long as it shall rain down upon the darkness of the grave showers of celestial sunshine, and hang the walls of humanity's long home with pictures of immortality. We will glory in the cross so long as in it inheres strength to "break the power of canceled sin," and set earth's prisoners free; so long as it shall plant the evergreen of life and "the flower of heaven's eternal spring" throughout the empire of death, and arch the sacred spot where slumber our long-lost dead with the rainbow of redemption! We will glory in the cross so long as it kindles a divine halo around the horizon of eternity, there forever hovering like a deathless splendor; so long as it supplies every child of faith with a girdle of glory, and from the tomb tunnels to immortality; yea, as long as earth shall spin and stars shall burn, as time shall roll and suns shall blaze, we will glory in the cross of a crucified, risen, and ascended Christ! We will glory

in the cross so long as men are born to die; so long as the recording angel registers human transgression; so long as the cross retains its divine significance; so long as the deathless soul, stamped by its God with the impress of immortality, strung for the harmonies of heaven, and thrilled with the power of an endless life, shall hunger for happiness, sigh for its rest, and sing of its home. Yes, we will glory in the cross so long as the deathless spirit, by the eye of faith, beholds the mighty vista of futurity, crowded with unfading splendors, forever flashing with intenser light as the capacious powers of the immortal soul unfold and expand amid the grand and sublime glories of its God; so long as it desires to drink deeper, rise higher, and penetrate farther into the profound revelations and exhaustless resources of its great Original. The cross will continue to brighten and increase in interest while eternal ages shall circle, and around the name of Jesus of Nazareth, the Saviour of the world, will cluster fresher laurels and gather a richer radiance. And when the loftiest spirits among the high-born sons of God wake the sweetest notes ever heard by angel ears, that ever rolled like a grand tidal-wave of glory over the plains and palaces of light and life, the cross shall constitute the burden and theme of their holy song—Christ's wonderful redemption, "God's remedy for sin."

God forbid, then, that we, as pilgrims hailing a distant land—a country beyond the ruins and ravages of earth—should glory, save in the cross! God forbid that we, as travelers across the isthmus of time, and looking forward to a world unsoiled by sin and unvis-

ited by death, should make any other theme our song of rejoicing. While, as an embattled host, we are moving onward and pressing upward to a rest and residence in a royal realm, where a cloud of glory ever pavilions the city of God, and light, brighter than the focal blaze of ten thousand suns, forever streams upon golden turrets and silver minarets, pinnacles and spires, lifting their glittering forms like fingers of fire amid the outspread branches of the tree of life; where birds of beauty ever bask their celestial plumage in showers of shining splendor; where limpid waters ever leap for joy upon living shores; where harps are never silent, and raptures never die, palms ever wave and crowns ever flash; "God forbid that we," the heirs to such an inheritance, "should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ!"

O the cross! the cross! the blessed cross! the refuge of our race, the hope of humanity, and palladium of the world! It will shield us from sin, and save us forever; it will give gravity to youth, grace to manhood, and strength to old age. Let us enthrone it in our hearts, and exhibit it in our lives. Let us make it at once the center and circumference of our theology, and pivotal thought of every sermon; let our words be winged and sentences vitalized by its magic power. Let us hide behind it, and not so much as allow the tips of our fingers to obscure its luster. In every event, circumstance, and condition of life, bring to view the cross. In seasons of sorrow and bereavement, adversity and affliction, temptation and trial, hold up the cross. If health hues the cheek, happiness fills the bosom,

and prosperity smiles upon your labors, hold up the cross. In life and in death hold it up. Hold up the cross, my brother, my sister, until God shall bid you exchange it for a crown. God grant that you may hold it up so high that all heaven shall see it, "and men everywhere embrace it." And at last may we unite with all the ransomed and redeemed of every continent and kingdom of earth around the burning throne of God, in the grand acclaim: "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen."

A TREATISE ON THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT.

BY THE REV. R. HINER, D.D.

"And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee."—Gen. xvii. 7.

IN the divine mind, the question of human salvation was present with, and constituted a part of, the thought and plan of creation and government. When humanity sinned, and fell in Eden, the purpose of redemption and the plan by which it was to be achieved were announced in the comprehensive language, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head." During a period of more than two thousand years this promise of salvation had but little amplification, except in a reminding and adumbrative system of worship by bloody sacrifices. After the building of the Tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues, and the consequent divisions of the race, God entered formally into covenant with Abraham. This covenant transaction embodied, substantially, all previous engagements between God and fallen man, and contained, in its terms and promises, the germs from which the perfected system of divine truth was subsequently to be developed.

If God's revelation to man is a tree, with branches, leaves, and fruit, the covenant made with Abraham is its root and trunk. If salvation from sin is paradise restored, the Abrahamic covenant is the garden, in which all the great rivers of truth and grace rise, and out of which they flow. If earth and heaven, sundered by sin, are brought together by the mercy of God in Christ Jesus, the covenant between God and Abraham is the golden link that connects them. If men became the children of God and members of his family, more numerous than the stars of heaven or the sands on the sea-shore, Abraham, by faith in his seed, promised in the covenant which God made with him, is the father of us all. If we have statutory laws constituting a part of the revelation of God to man, the covenant with Abraham is constitutional, or organic, law authorizing these statutory provisions and enactments, and is the recognized standard by which they are to be expounded.

These reflections are suggestive of the position the Abrahamic covenant occupies, by divine arrangement, in the vast system of revealed truth, and prepare the way for a proper investigation of it.

We cannot approximate an exhaustive or satisfactory investigation of the Abrahamic covenant if we fail to consider whether God made with him more than one covenant. The importance of this inquiry can only be appreciated by us in proportion to the interest we have taken in the conflicting views and theories of Antipedobaptists, and Pedobaptist Churches, for more than two centuries past. That we may have before us a clear statement of

the views of Antipedobaptists on this subject, we will make a few extracts from the writings of Mr. Alexander Campbell and his brethren. Mr. Campbell makes this unequivocal statement in his "Debate with Rice" (p. 309): "I say again, God made three covenants with Abraham; one all spirit, one all flesh, and one all property." Mr. Wilkes, in his "Debate with Ditzler" (p. 34), says: "But God made another covenant with Abraham, and through him another promise to the world." Mr. Brooks makes the following statement in his "Debate with Fitch" (page 85): "Now, then, I have positively dated three covenants." These three distinguished Antipedobaptist authorities are sufficient to set forth the views of that school of Bible expounders; and their united testimony is that God made with Abraham a plurality of covenants. Pedobaptists, of all denominations, are of a contrary opinion, and maintain that God made with Abraham but one covenant, and for the correctness of their position appeal to the Scriptures, the only source of evidence on this subject.

While it is admitted that the Apostle Paul more than once in his Epistles uses the plural form of the word covenant—"covenants of promise," etc.—yet it is at the same time justly claimed that he does not say these "covenants" were made with Abraham. He informs us that God did make a covenant with his people through the mediation of Moses, which is called the law, "when he took them by the hand to lead them out of Egypt," which was not according to the covenant they had broken, and which was to be renewed with them

upon the house of Israel and the house of Judah, and which is called, indifferently, the "new covenant" and the covenant made with Abraham. To these "covenants"—the one made between God and his people at Sinai, by the mediation of Moses, and the other with Abraham directly, four hundred and thirty years before—the apostle refers when he speaks of covenants in his Epistles, and not to a plurality of covenants made with Abraham. That God made but *one* covenant with Abraham is a proposition that is susceptible of the clearest proof, from the highest source of evidence in matters of this sort—the word of God. The first argument by which we propose to establish the proposition stated above is drawn from the several statements of this solemn transaction between the Almighty and his servant Abraham in the book of Genesis. In the twelfth chapter of Genesis, Moses gives us the following account of it: "Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee: and I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: and I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee: and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

He would be a very careless reader, indeed, who would fail to discover an agreement made and entered into between the parties here mentioned. Abram was to leave his country, his kindred, and his father's house, and go unto a land afterward to be made known unto him. God, on the other

hand, obligated himself to do three things for him and through him. 1. He promised him a numerous natural offspring: "And I will make of thee a great nation." 2. He promised to give unto him the land of Canaan. This promise is implied in what Abram agreed to do, according to divine requirement, "Get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee," but is formally expressed in the seventh verse. After Abram had reached the land to which the Lord had directed him, he was met by the Almighty: "And the Lord appeared unto Abram and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land." 3. He promised him spiritual blessings for all nations: "And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

In the brief but comprehensive record of an interview between the Almighty and Abram before us and under consideration, Moses gives us one contract with three specifications on the part of God, or *one* covenant with three promises.

In the fifteenth chapter an account of another interview between the parties is given, and a restatement of the covenant made and entered into at the first interview and recorded in the twelfth chapter: "And he (God) brought him (Abram) forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be. And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness. And he said unto him, I am the Lord that

brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it."

In the seventh verse the promise before made and recorded in the seventh verse of the twelfth chapter, to give him the land of Canaan, is repeated. In this respect, therefore, it is clear that the covenant recorded in these two chapters is one and the same. In the fifth verse of the fifteenth chapter we have a twofold promise—"Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be"—1. A promise of a numerous natural offspring, corresponding to the promise recorded in the second verse of the twelfth chapter: "And I will make of thee a great nation." 2. A promise of an innumerable spiritual seed, including Jesus Christ, who was evidently the object of his faith, corresponding to the promise recorded in the third verse of the twelfth chapter: "And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

From the two items last mentioned, as well as from the one noticed above, it is clear that the covenant recorded in these two chapters is the same, and the promises the same. If, however, the spirituality of the promise contained in the words, "Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be," should be questioned, all doubt on that subject will be removed by a consideration of the fact that by faith in this promise, or the subject of it, Abraham obtained the pardon of his sins. "And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him

for righteousness." (Verse 6.) "Righteousness," in this passage, has the sense of forgiveness, or pardon of sin; and forgiveness of sin being a spiritual blessing, therefore the covenant in this place embraced and promised Christ and all spiritual blessings in him. This view of the passage is confirmed by Rom. iv. 18–25: "Who against hope believing in hope, that he might become the father of many nations, according to that which was spoken (Gen. xv. 5), *So shall thy seed be.* And being not weak in faith, he considered not his own body now dead, when he was about a hundred years old, neither yet the deadness of Sarah's womb: he staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded, that what he had promised, he was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification."

In this brief passage, in his Epistle to the Romans, the Apostle Paul makes two quotations from the fifteenth chapter of Genesis: "So shall thy seed be," and "it was imputed to him for righteousness;" thereby establishing the spirituality of the covenant with Abraham recorded there, and identifying it as the same covenant that is found in the twelfth chapter, containing the promise, "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

A third interview between the contracting parties

is recorded, Gen. xvii. 1–14: "When Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly. And Abram fell on his face: and God talked with him, saying, As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God. And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee: Every man child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in thy house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money,

must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant. And the uncircumcised man child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant."

That the transaction recorded in this chapter, in its promises and provisions, is a repetition of what had transpired before between the Almighty and Abram, and recorded in the twelfth and fifteenth chapters, will appear from a brief consideration of its leading features, and references made to them, both by the Almighty himself and inspired writers in the New Testament.

In the eighth verse of the chapter now under consideration God obligated himself to give unto Abraham and to his seed after him all the land of Canaan: "And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession." That this is a new promise, in the sense that it had never been given before, none will contend, for it had been made twice anterior to this, and is recorded Gen. xii. 1–7 and xv. 7–18. The promise in this respect, in these three places, being the same, the covenant must be the same.

In the fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh verses, we have again the twofold promise of a numerous natural and spiritual seed: "As for me, behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee. And I will make

thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." That nations of natural descendants are here promised to Abraham must be admitted by all. Therefore, as this is but a repetition of a promise made twice before, to bless Abraham with a numerous natural offspring, it is a part of a single covenant made with him and recorded three times by the inspired historian.

But that a spiritual seed, including Christ, is promised in the interview between the parties now under consideration, may be questioned by some, and may not be clear to others. All questions, however, of this sort are settled, and all doubts on this subject are removed, by the highest authority in these matters. In his argument on justification by faith, the Apostle Paul refers to this promise in such way as to show that he understood it in a spiritual sense, and as including Christ. Rom. iv. 13–17: "For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect: because the law worketh wrath: for where no law is, there is no transgression. Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father

of us all. As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations." It is to be noticed that the apostle here quotes a part of the fifth verse of Gen. xvii. — "For a father of many nations have I made thee"—and thereby authorizes the belief, and confirms the position, that the covenant with Abraham, completed and sealed as recorded in this chapter, provided for and promised pardon of sin through faith in Jesus Christ. It is also to be observed that "I have made thee a father of many nations," in the fifth verse of Gen. xvii., is understood by the apostle as equivalent to being made heir of the world. (Rom. iv. 13.) But Abraham was made heir of the world through the righteousness of faith, and not by becoming literally the father of all men. Therefore, the covenant made with Abraham, as recorded in this chapter, contained Christ and all spiritual blessings, and is but a repetition of the covenant recorded in the twelfth and fifteenth chapters. But we have higher than even apostolic authority to sustain the position that the Abrahamic covenant in Gen. xvii. contained Christ and all spiritual blessings. In the seventh verse the Almighty said unto Abraham, "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee." But, then, as the Lord had promised Abraham, in each of three interviews they had held touching this everlasting covenant, both a natural and a spiritual seed, it will be necessary for us to ascertain whether this covenant, and particularly this part of it, had reference to Abraham's

natural descendants or to his spiritual seed. On this point we are not left without information; in the nineteenth verse we have this: "And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt eall his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him." Verse 21: "But my covenant will I establish with Isaac, which Sarah shall bear unto thee at this set time in the next year." That the covenant made with Abraham and established in Isaac and his seed is the covenant of salvation, the proof is abundant. Heb. xi. 11, 12 is in point: "Through faith also Sarah herself received strength to eonceive seed, and was delivered of a ehild when she was past age, beeause she judged him faithful who had promised. Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, so many as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea shore innumerable." In this passage the apostle quotes the promise made to Abraham in the fifth verse of Gen. xv.—"And tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be"—and thereby connects the whole passage with the faith of Abraham, which had Christ for its object, inasmuch as it was imputed to him for righteousness, or pardon of sin. From this it is evident that the apostle understood the seed of Abraham, in Isaae, to be a spiritual seed.

In harmony with these things, the apostle, in commenting on the trial of Abraham when called of God to offer up his son Isaac as a burnt sacrifice, said: "By faith Abraham, when he was tried,

offered up Isaac: and he that had received the promises offered up his only begotten son, of whom it was said, That in Isaac shall thy seed be called." (Heb. xi. 17, 18.) This is the seed with whom God established his covenant (Gen. xvi. 7), and that it is his spiritual seed, including Christ, is placed beyond the shadow of a doubt by the Apostle Paul (Rom. ix. 6–9): "Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect. For they are not all Israel, which are of Israel: neither, because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children: but, In Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, They which are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed. For this is the word of promise, At this time will I come, and Sarah shall have a son."

By "the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God," the apostle means such of Abraham's natural descendants as did not believe the promise of Christ and spiritual blessings in the covenant made with their father. "These are not the children of God: but the children of the promise are counted for the seed;" that is, such as believe the promise are "the children of God." Here the apostle separates all other things promised to Abraham from the spiritual, and leaves no doubt as to the spirituality of the seed promised him in Isaac. To confirm the position that Abraham's seed, in Isaac, is a spiritual seed, it is only necessary to consider the apostle's illustration of it (Gal. iv. 22–31): "For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bond-maid, the other by a

free-woman. But he who was of the bond-woman was born after the flesh; but he of the free-woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath a husband. Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now. Nevertheless, what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bond-woman and her son: for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman. So then, brethren, we are not children of the bond-woman, but of the free."

The free-woman is the covenant God made with Abraham, and established in Isaac, and with his seed after him, and is the mother of us all—is the mother of us all who believe in Christ. Without any reasoning of ours, the apostle in this passage settles the question of the spirituality of the covenant recorded Gen. xvii. That this covenant included and promised Christ is clear from Gal. iii. 15–18: "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men: Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises

made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise." Verse 29: "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

The apostle here affirms that the seed promised Abraham by the Almighty in Isaac is Christ, and that in Christ this covenant is confirmed, and that all who are Christ's are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. If any should inquire how this covenant was confirmed in Christ, and when, the answer is found in Heb. vi. 13–18: "For when God made promise to Abraham, because he could swear by no greater, he sware by himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. And so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise. For men verily swear by the greater: and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to shew unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by two immutable things, in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before us." From the quotation of Heb. vi. 14, "Saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will

multiply thee," we learn that the oath by which God confirmed this promise to Abraham was announced to him at the altar from which his son Isaac had just been raised as from the dead; but that the promise, confirmed by the oath recorded Gen. xxii. 16, is the promise of a son by Sarah, who should be called Isaac (Gen. xvii. 17), and whose seed is Christ (Gal. iii. 16), is evident from Heb. vi. 15: "And so, after he had patiently endured, he obtained the promise;" that is, Isaac was born. The heirs of this promise, confirmed by an oath, were those in the apostle's day who had fled for refuge to lay hold upon the hope set before them, which hope was Christ, the promised seed of Isaac. (Gen. xvii. 19.)

Additional proof of the spiritual and Messianic character of the Abrahamic covenant, recorded Gen. xvii., is drawn from the nature of the obligations it imposed upon him, and his seed after him, and the corresponding "exceeding great and precious promises" given by the Almighty in it. The Lord appeared unto Abram, and said, "I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect." This is the obligation, proposed by the Almighty, and accepted by Abram. It consists of two parts: First, "*Walk before me.*" This bound Abram to recognize, constantly, the being, perfections, presence, and authority of God; and was equivalent to a promise to "have no other God." Secondly, "*Be thou perfect.*" By accepting this requirement, Abram pledged himself to acknowledge the relations subsisting between him and God on the one hand, and between him and his fellow-men

on the other, and obligated himself to discharge all the duties arising out of these relations. The order in which these relations occurred and their relative importance were suggestive to him as to whom he owed his first, freest, and purest services. Priority and significance of relationship authoritatively settled the claim of God upon him, as first and paramount. The relations subsisting between Abram and God, and Abram and mankind, being perfect in their nature, and the duties arising out of them corresponding with them in this respect, these duties being discharged, Abram, in God's estimation, was a perfect man. But man, by the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, is restored to relations from which he, by transgression, fell, and in these relations he can only hope to stand by discharging the obligations growing out of them; but of his inability to meet these requirements he is painfully conscious. To meet his necessities in this respect the promise is given to Abram, "And I will be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee." This promise is as comprehensive as the nature, perfections, and resources of the Almighty, and as the necessities of Abram were numerous, varied, and pressing. Here is a promise of divine aid in attaining the perfection required and pledged. Divine aid, however, is extended to none but through Jesus Christ. But the Almighty promised to be a God unto Abram, and required of him perfection; and Abram "believed in the Lord; and it was counted to him for righteousness." Therefore, Abram had redemption and divine strength through Jesus Christ, his promised seed in Isaac, Sarah's

son. These three statements of the covenant made with Abraham by Moses, in the twelfth, fifteenth, and seventeenth chapters of Genesis, and the frequent references made to them in the New Testament, establish beyond all controversy the position of Pedobaptist Churches, that God made but one covenant with Abraham, and that that covenant is the covenant of salvation for all time and for all people. This position, however, is greatly strengthened by the fact that the Almighty so frequently speaks of his covenant with Abraham in the singular, and never in the plural. Gen. xvii. 2: "And I will make my covenant between me and thee." Verse 4: "My covenant is with thee." Verse 7: "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee," etc., "for an everlasting covenant," etc. Verse 9: "Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore," etc. Verse 10: "This is my covenant, which ye shall keep," etc. Verse 11: "And it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you." Verse 13: "And my covenant shall be in your flesh," etc. Verse 14: "He hath broken my covenant." Gen. xv. 18, Moses said: "In that same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram."

The facts here are significant. In the brief record of the statement of this covenant with Abraham, and its establishment in Isaac, the Almighty states it, or speaks of it, ten different times in the singular, and Moses once. The position being established, by the uniform testimony of Scripture, that God made but *one* covenant with Abraham, it follows, as an unavoidable sequence, that circumcis-

ion was the token of that covenant. If it were true, however, that God made three covenants with Abraham instead of one, as Antipedobaptists contend, nevertheless, the position of Pedobaptists is sustained by the Scriptures, that circumcision is the token of the covenant concerning Christ, Abraham's seed in Isaac, who was the son of promise by Sarah. It is only the more important that we hear the testimony of the Scriptures as to the covenant of which circumcision is the sign, or token, inasmuch as on its position and significance the strength of the argument, both for and against the unity of the Church, or body, of Christ, depends. Immersionists generally, and Antipedobaptists universally, sacrifice the unity of the kingdom of God, in their vain attempt to overthrow infant baptism. Indeed, in the madness of their ravings, they have gone so far as to say they intended to put children out of the covenant of salvation altogether; and having succeeded, as they supposed, in doing so, they have undertaken the difficult, and even absurd, work of originating a theory of safety for them without Christ, without atonement, and without mediation. The importance of our investigation being suggested by these things, we will proceed to state, from their own authorities, their views of the position and significance of circumcision, and to an examination of the Scriptures adduced in support of them.

Mr. Campbell says ("Debate with Rice," p. 295): "Circumcision was but the sign of a covenant to the whole Jewish nation." Again (same page): "I argue that there were no spiritual blessings in circumcision, else females had not been at all ex-

cluded." Page 297: "That circumcision was peculiar in its nature, character, and design—that it was the sign of the same privilege to all its subjects, and, consequently, never was the sign of any spiritual blessing in Christ to anyone of them." "That the covenant of which it was a sign was not the covenant of the Christian Church, will appear most evident," etc. The position of Antipedobaptists, that circumcision was not the sign of any "spiritual blessing in Christ," but a seal of the covenant with Abraham concerning his natural descendants, by Sarah, and the land of Canaan, is clearly stated here by Mr. Campbell. In sustaining this position, Mr. Campbell relies mainly on his own reasoning, only calling to his aid a few passages of Scripture which he tortures into his service. Speaking of the Jewish institution, as he calls it, after it was organized at Sinai, Mr. Campbell says ("Debate with Rice," p. 293): "It is important to observe that circumcision was appended to the institution, and was incorporated with it. It was taken, as it were, from the hand of Abraham, and put into the hands of Moses. It becomes a national, from a patriarchal, affair." To wrest circumcision from the covenant of salvation, upon which God had placed it as its "token," and to justify himself in the unwarranted act, Mr. Campbell quotes John vii. 22, 23: "Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision; (not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers;) and ye on the sabbath day circumcise a man. If a man on the sabbath day receive circumcision, that the law of Moses should not be broken, are ye angry at me, because I have made a man every whit whole on the sabbath

day?" No one can fail to perceive that Mr. Campbell's ingenuity, however great, failed in this instance to bring him success; for the Saviour plainly informs the Jews in this passage that circumcision is not of Moses, but of the fathers. Moreover, the Apostle Paul shows very clearly how it came to pass that circumcision became a part of the law of Moses (Gal. iii. 19): "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgression till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." To what was the law added? This question the apostle answers in the 18th verse: "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." The law of Moses, therefore, was added to the covenant made with Abraham concerning Christ, the promised seed which was to come. Indeed, the law was added to all that had gone before; and Mr. Campbell might have said, with equal propriety, of Abraham's faith and the pardon of sin it brought him, and the Christ in whom he believed, and through whom he obtained pardon, as of circumcision, They were all "taken, as it were, from the hand of Abraham and put into the hands of Moses." The truth is, however, that neither circumcision nor any thing else was taken from the hand of Abraham and given to Moses, but Moses and the law were added to Abraham, and faith, and pardon, and circumcision, till the seed should come to whom the promises were made. The covenant with Abraham promising Christ, and requiring faith in him and pardon of sin through him, whose token was circumcision, held on down through the ages, receiving additions

to it, till it was completed, finished, perfected in Christ, embracing and given to all nations for all time. If, however, we can ascertain from the Scriptures the design or significance of circumcision, we thereby settle all questions in controversy as to chronology, and the branch of the Abrahamic covenant to which it belongs. If circumcision was the token of the promise of a large family of natural descendants, or of the land of Canaan, or of both, as Antipedobaptists claim, then, of course, it would always be referred to and spoken of in the Scriptures in connection with these things; but if we do not find it mentioned in connection with the land or family contract as a token, or type, of them, we may not hesitate to conclude that it was not a token of them. Furthermore, if it should be found that circumcision is mentioned in the Scriptures, any number of times, as a token of the family or land promise, or of both of them, nevertheless, if it is also used by inspired writers as a sign, or token, of pardon of sin, purity of heart, the work of grace in the heart, and a spiritual state of the people of God, the position of Pedobaptists, that it is the token of the covenant of salvation, is established as correct. The position of Pedobaptists of all denominations is that God made with Abraham but one covenant. This position we have established by testimony abundant, clear, and competent. It follows, therefore, of necessity, that circumcision was the token, or sign, of that covenant. It is admitted, however, that the covenant with Abraham contained promises of other things than Christ and spiritual blessings in him; and if it should be granted

that circumcision was the token of these promises, it is nevertheless true that it was the token, or sign, of the promise of Christ and all spiritual blessings in him, and consequently it was the token of the covenant of salvation to Abraham, to Moses, and to all the Jews, as such, even down to the present day. Then, until Antipedobaptists make it plain that circumcision is never referred to, spoken of, or used in the Scriptures, in a single instance, as a sign, or token, of faith in Christ, pardon of sin, the work of grace in the heart, restoration from sin, or from a backslidden to a spiritual state, or of purity of heart, their position, as stated by Mr. Campbell and others, that it "never was the sign of any spiritual blessing to anyone," "that the covenant of which it was the sign was not the covenant of the Christian Church," is not to be accepted, because it depends entirely upon human reason for support, and is unauthorized by the word of God. On the other hand, if Pedobaptists show that inspired writers, both of the Old Testament and of the New, use circumcision as a sign, or figure, of pardon of sin and purity of heart, by the Spirit and grace of God, we not only overthrow the views of Antipedobaptists, but we establish the position of Pedobaptists as true, that circumcision was the token of the covenant of salvation, and consequently of all spiritual blessings in Christ. On no other single point is the Bible so abundant in testimony as it is on the spiritual significance of circumcision. Rom. iv. 11: "And he (Abraham) received the *sign* of circumcision, a *seal* of the *righteousness* of the *faith* which he had, yet being uncircumcised: that he might be

the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also."

The apostle in this passage affirms of circumcision that it was "a sign." This corresponds with God's statement with regard to it when he ordained it (Gen. xvii. 11): "And it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you."

As a "sign," or "token," it reminded Abraham of all his engagements with God, and especially of his obligation to walk before him and be perfect. It was also suggestive to him of his faith in the promises of God, but more particularly of his faith in the promise, Gen. xii. 3: "And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed," and Gen. xv. 4, 5, 6: "But he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir. And he brought him forth abroad, and said, Look now toward heaven, and tell the stars, if thou be able to number them: and he said unto him, So shall thy seed be. And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness."

That Abraham's faith, which was "counted to him for righteousness," included and rested on Christ, is evident from the fact that neither the belief of a promise of a tract of land nor the possession of the land promised could be made the ground, or the condition, of the pardon of sin and an inward state of righteousness; nor could the ability to become the father of a large family of children be accepted as an atonement for sin, or as the condition of pardon and sanctification: "For without shedding of blood is no remission." In addition

to these things, it is to be remembered that the faith of Abraham is the faith required by the Almighty, from that day to this, as the condition of pardon and a state of subjective righteousness before him. Rom. iv. 11, 12: "That he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also: and the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised." Verses 23–25: "Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." Gal. iii. 29: "And if ye be *Christ's*, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Christ was Abraham's seed by Sarah, in Isaac, and we by faith in Christ become members of his body, and children of Abraham by promise, as was Isaac. Our faith has Christ for its object, but the faith of Abraham is the faith required by divine authority of all men everywhere at the present time as the condition of pardon and regeneration; therefore, Abraham's faith had Christ for its object, and pardon of sin and regeneration for its end. In view of these incontestable proofs, the conclusion is inevitable that circumcision was a sign, or "token," of Abraham's faith in Christ, through whom he obtained pardon of sin, and through whom he was accounted righteous before God.

Circumcision was to Abram a seal as well as a sign. As a seal, it was to him an expression, on the part of God, of satisfaction with the perfection, or righteousness, to which he had attained by faith in him according to his promise. As a *sign*, circumcision was to Abraham a suggestive reminder of the obligations he had taken, and the faith he had in God's promise to give him a spiritual "seed in Isaac, which was Christ." As a seal, it was an expression to him, on the part of God, of satisfaction with, and acceptance of, his servant Abraham, according to the covenant they had made and entered into many years before. Here circumcision stands in the midst of spiritual things as their divinely-appointed token and seal. The spiritual significance of circumcision is unquestionable in Rom. ii. 28, 29: "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." Outwardly, he was a natural descendant of Abraham—had his divinely-given portion in the land of Canaan, and the mark of circumcision in the flesh; but these things did not make a Jew. To become a Jew, he must have the faith of Abraham and the circumcision of the heart. Circumcision, therefore, as God and the Apostle Paul understood it, had no reference to the family of Abraham after the flesh, nor to the land of Canaan, but to Abraham's spiritual seed in Christ; and he that received the mark, or token, of circumcision in the flesh, and did not, through the faith of

Abraham, obtain the pardon of his sins, and the regeneration of his spirit, was not circumcised at all. Without spiritual regeneration, circumcision was a mere act of cutting the flesh, a concision (Phil. iii. 2): "Beware of the concision." That is, beware of those who reduce circumcision to a mere mark, or cutting, in the flesh. Verse 3: "For we are the circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." The testimony of the apostle in this passage is important as to the significance of circumcision, and the lesson is a plain one. All who receive Christ Jesus, and rejoice, or exult, in him as their only and personal Saviour, and worship God in the spirit, are the true concision, according to the original design and intent of circumcision, as the sign, or "token," of the covenant with Abraham concerning Christ, and as a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, and which is now required of all men. Col. ii. 11: "In whom (Christ) also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ." The apostle here, as in Rom. ii. 28, 29, affirms that circumcision is in the spirit, and contrasts it with its token, or sign, which was literal. Circumcision is made without hands; its "token" was made with hands. Circumcision puts "off the body of the *sins* of the flesh;" its "token" put away the "foreskin of the flesh." Circumcision is Christ; "Christ in you the hope of glory" is circumcision. All who have Christ have the true circumcision, the great blessing promised in the Abrahamic covenant of which the

cutting in the flesh was the token and the seal. That the prophets and all godly people, from Abraham to Christ, understood the spiritual import of circumcision, and used it as a token of purity of heart, and not as a sign of the land of Canaan, is clear from a few passages, out of many of equal clearness, which we now quote from the Old Testament. Deut. x. 16: "Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiffnecked." Jer. ix. 26: "For all these nations are uncircumcised, and all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in the heart." Jer. iv. 4: "Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskin of your heart, ye men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem; lest my fury come forth like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings." These people had the "token" of circumcision, but were not circumcised. They had backslidden, and were wicked. They were commanded to "circumcise themselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskin of their hearts." This was equivalent to a command to repent, and seek forgiveness of sin and restoration to the favor and love of God. Lev. xxvi. 41: "If then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity." Ezek. xliv. 9: "Thus saith the Lord God, No stranger, uncircumcised in heart, nor uncircumcised in flesh, shall enter into my sanctuary." Deut. xxx. 6: "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live."

Other scriptures might be quoted, but these are

sufficient to satisfy all reasonable inquirers after truth that circumcision, throughout its entire history, was understood by the people of God to be a spiritual operation, performed without hands upon the heart by the Spirit and grace of God, putting away sin, and that the mark, or cutting, in the flesh was but a sign, or token, of it. It is eminently proper, in concluding our argument on the spirituality of circumcision, to notice that while it was a seal of the righteousness of faith, or of the righteousness which is through, or by, faith, it was at the same time a sign, or "token," of the object of faith, through which alone righteousness could be obtained. It was the sign, or "token," of the seed promised to Abraham by Sarah in Isaac, which seed was Christ (Gal. iii. 16): "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." As a sign of Christ, the Seed of promise which was to come, of necessity it had to be discontinued when the promise was fulfilled in the person of the man Christ Jesus. This, in all probability, was the only reason for its discontinuance. This view of the whole subject of circumcision—its appointment, design, and termination—is sustained by the fact that the Jews who rejected Christ continued the practice of circumcision, thereby proclaiming their rejection of Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ, and their belief in a Messiah yet to come; while those of them who received Jesus as the long-looked for Christ, after a time, ceased to circumcise their children, and to practice it in any way or for any pur-

pose. Furthermore, this view of circumcision is authorized by the statements and reasoning of the apostle, Gal. v. 2–4: "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace."

The apostle here states that circumcision obligated its subjects to keep the whole law; not only the moral law, but also the ceremonial law. But the ceremonial law being typical of Christ to come, in most of its appointments and services, as well as circumcision, his reasoning is conclusive that, if they trusted in these things, "Christ should profit them nothing;" "they were fallen from grace," for circumcision, from the time it was placed upon Abraham as a "token" of the covenant that promised him a seed by Sarah in Isaac, which seed was Christ, looked to the coming of that Seed. Jesus of Nazareth was that Seed, and circumcision, with all other types, or signs, or tokens, of him, terminated in him, in the estimation of all who accepted him in his Messianic character; while, on the other hand, all who did not receive him as the Christ continued circumcision as the expression of their rejection of him, and as the declaration of their faith in a Messiah to come. By testimony abundant, clear, and rendered in almost all the forms that evidence can take upon itself, we have established the spirituality of circumcision, and thereby have strengthened and confirmed all other

arguments in favor of the position that the Abrahamic covenant, of which circumcision was the sign, or "token," was the covenant concerning Christ, and all spiritual blessings in him, for all nations of men, and for all time.

There are other proofs of the perpetuity of the Abrahamic covenant than those we have found lying immediately along the line of our investigation. Some of these we now proceed to bring forward, not that we need them to support the proposition under consideration, but more particularly because they belong to that class of truths we have undertaken to arrange in their proper order for the convenience of the student of the Bible. In the government God ordained for man, as in all human governments made by the people, and for them, there is organic, or constitutional, law, and laws of a statutory, or provisional, character. Organic law is the source and authority of statutory law, and the latter has no force only in so far as it agrees with the former. Statutory laws are ordained because of existing or prospective necessities of the parties interested, and may expire by limitation, or be modified or repealed by the parties that ordained them, when there no longer exists a necessity for them, and yet the organic law of the State, or the nation, remain in full force. Constitutional, or organic, law is never changed—indeed, cannot be changed, except by a convention of the parties, or their successors and representatives, who were present and acting when it was ordained. Furthermore, when an existing constitution has been set aside, or annulled, by the parties that ordained it,

and another has been framed and accepted, it devolves upon the parties acting for those interested to publish the new constitution, or covenant, to those who are to be governed by it. Now, until it shall be shown from the Scriptures that God and Abraham, the parties who met and ordained, confirmed and published to the world, the covenant of salvation which is the constitutional law of the organic existence of the people of God, had a subsequent meeting, in their own persons, or in their authorized and announced successors and representatives, at a stated time and specified place, and changed the covenant they had previously made and confirmed, or annulled it entirely, and ordained a new one, we are compelled to believe that they never had a second meeting for such purposes, and that the covenant they made at the first is still in force, and full of blessings for the world, and the only authority, divinely given, whereby any people can claim to be, or hope to become, the people of God. Let those who contend that the Abrahamic covenant has been abolished, and that a new covenant has been made and confirmed, furnish the record containing the facts of the meeting of the parties, the time and place of the meeting, and that there and then a new covenant was ordained, established, and recorded, which is as follows—here let the covenant be read—and that the Abrahamic covenant is hereby annulled, with all of its requirements of man and all its promises on the part of God to our fallen world. Before they can remove the first they must present us with the second. If the Abrahamic covenant has been abolished, it has

been done since the time Paul wrote his Epistle to the Galatians. In that Epistle he states fully his understanding of this matter, as follows:

Gal. iii. 15–18: "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men, Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise: but God gave it to Abraham by promise."

Here the apostle, reasoning from the history of covenants among men, "that though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be *confirmed*, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto," strengthened the statement of fact he had so often made, and helped forward the conclusion he had reached by his own investigations, and which was made sure by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, that the covenant between God and Abraham, being more than a MAN'S covenant, and being confirmed on the part of God by an oath, *had not been, and could not be, disannulled.* In addition to this, and as though he intended to prevent any misunderstanding or confusion on account of, or arising out of, the fact that the Almighty made a covenant with his people through the mediation of Moses at Sinai, which covenant was to be "taken away," he says in this passage: "The law,

which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." His position is that notwithstanding the law given at Sinai was a covenant, and was given four hundred and thirty years after the covenant was made with Abraham, it did not annul, supersede, repeal, or in any way set aside, the Abrahamic covenant. It was "added" to the Abrahamic covenant "because of transgression, till the seed should come"—till Christ should come, in whom its typical services were to terminate. That this is what he meant by the *law* is clear from Eph. ii. 15: "The law of commandments contained in ordinances." These ordinances were appointments of services for the tabernacle and the temple, which were typical of Christ until he should come, and in whose flesh they were to be abolished, while the Abrahamic covenant should hold on its way through all time, bearing in its arms of fulfilled promise the world's Redeemer, rich in all spiritual blessings for all the nations of the earth. "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." To Abraham God promised a son by Sarah, whose name should be Isaac, and a seed in him, which was Christ, in whom "all the families of the earth should be blessed." To Christ, Abraham's Seed in Isaac, God promised "the heathen for an inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for a possession." "The heathen" (Ps. ii. 8) are the Gentiles. Gal. iii. 14: "That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we

might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith."

The argument is this: The heathen were promised to Jesus Christ by the Eternal Father (Ps. ii. 8), and the blessing of Abraham was to come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ. But Jesus Christ is the Seed promised to Abraham by the Almighty, in the covenant he made with him, Gen. xvii. 1–21. Therefore, as Jesus possesses the Gentiles, and as they enjoy the blessing of Abraham in him, the covenant that gave Christ to Abraham, and the blessing of Abraham, through him, to Gentiles, exists, and is still in force, and must be perpetual. This will appear in a still clearer light when we remember that the "blessing of Abraham," which was to come on the Gentiles, was not the land of Canaan, nor a large family of natural descendants, but pardon of sin, and spiritual regeneration through faith in Jesus Christ.

Rom. iv. 20–25: "He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded, that what he had promised, he was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification."

The blessing Abraham received came upon him through faith in the promise of the covenant God made with him. The same blessing was to come on

the Gentiles through Jesus Christ. That blessing was "righteousness." "And he believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for righteousness." (Gen. xv. 6.) "And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness." (Rom. iv. 22.) Jesus Christ, therefore, was the promise embraced by Abraham's faith in the covenant he was a party to with God; and that covenant being the only one ever made concerning Christ, it secures to the Gentiles all the rights and interests they have in him, as nations, and bestows the blessing of Abraham on such of them, as individuals, as have the faith of Abraham—which righteousness included the pardon of sin and personal regeneration. The only ground of hope the Gentiles ever had, have now, or will have, in the future of salvation, is the covenant which God made with Abraham, and through the faith which he had in the Christ promised unto him. As long as the blessing of Abraham shall be needed by the Gentiles, and as long as they have any authority to hope for it, or God continues to bestow it, Christ must be the medium of its reception and communication, and the *covenant* with him must stand. In this connection, it is of the highest importance that we take into consideration the fact that the plan by which the Almighty possessed the Gentiles of the blessing of Abraham beautifully harmonizes with, and grows out of, the perpetuity of the Abrahamic covenant. This plan is given by the apostle, Rom. xi. 1–5. "I say then, Hath God cast away his people? God forbid. For I also am an Israelite, of the seed of Abraham, of the tribe of Benjamin. God hath not cast away his people which he

foreknew. Wot ye not what the Scripture saith of Elias? how he maketh intercession to God against Israel, saying, Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life. But what saith the answer of God unto him? I have reserved to myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to the image of Baal. Even so then at this present time also there is a remnant according to the election of grace." The meaning of this passage is obvious. As in the days of the Prophet Elijah there was so great a falling away of the people of God that the prophet, after he had been so frightened by the queen, King Ahab's wife, as to abandon his post of duty, and leave the reformation in Israel, so gloriously begun, half accomplished, and flee for his life, in defending his own cowardly backsliding, said, "Lord, they have killed thy prophets, and digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life," God had, at the same time, seven thousand people: so in the days of Christ, notwithstanding the thousands of his people who had fallen through unbelief, yet there were many thousands who remained steadfast in the faith of their father Abraham, accepting Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ promised to him—a remnant according to the election of grace. "Even so at this present time," as though God had said, As the seven thousand in the days of Elijah and Israel's idolatrous apostasy represented and perpetuated Abraham as his seed, in the covenant which God made with him concerning Christ, the remnant according to the election of grace, in the days of Christ and his apostles, repre-

sented the covenant, and faith, and righteousness of Abraham, and perpetuated the body of people known as Abraham's seed, the people of God, and the *Church* of God. "To this remnant" of the people of God, who stood steadfast in *the faith*, the Gentiles were brought, and into them they were grafted.

Rom. xi. 13–24: "For I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I magnify mine office: if by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are of my flesh, and might save some of them. For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead? For if the first fruit be holy, the lump is also holy: and if the root be holy, so are the branches. And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou being a wild olive-tree were graffed in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree; boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, the branches were broken off, that I might be graffed in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore, the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off. And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be graffed in: for God is able to graff them in again. For if thou wert cut out of the olive-tree which is wild by nature, and wert

graffed contrary to nature into a good olive-tree; how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be graffed into their own olive-tree?" The figure is a tree. The old Abrahamic root and trunk, with a few branches remaining, stood, as the covenant, faith, Christ, and righteousness, in "the remnant," according to the election of grace, while the Gentiles, as a scion, or branch, were brought and grafted into this old stock, and became branches of it by the faith of Abraham. Without a figure, the "remnant" of the Jews, who received Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ promised in the Abrahamic covenant, constituted and preserved the Church. Into this Church the Gentiles were received. Consequently we are correct when we say the plan by which God bestowed the blessing of Abraham on the Gentiles confirms the position that the Abrahamic covenant is the covenant of the Church today, and will be its covenant to the end of time. Notwithstanding the length and conclusiveness of our argument on the spirituality and perpetuity of the Abrahamic covenant, of which circumcision was the "token," yet the subject could not be entirely clear and satisfactory to the ordinary reader of the Bible were we to fail to consider those passages of Scripture which are so constantly used by Antipedobaptists to prove that the Abrahamic covenant was to be abolished at the coming of Christ, and that a new covenant was to be made with the kingdom of Christ which was then to be set up for the first time. These passages, we now proceed to show, when correctly understood, are in perfect accord with the position we have established—that the

covenant of God with Abraham is the covenant of salvation, and consequently is the covenant of the Church for all time and for all people.

Jer. xxxi. 31: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah." This passage is quoted, Heb. viii. 8. If the word *make*, in this passage, *necessarily* means to originate, or bring into existence, something that had not existed before, then Antipedobaptists are, to some extent, sustained by it; but if it does not *necessarily* have this meaning, they have no authority to use it in support of their views. The meaning of this word must be determined by its use in other passages of Scripture, the lexicons, and the tenor of Bible instruction on the subject in connection with which it is employed. The uniform testimony of our English Bible, except in this passage, on the covenant of Abraham, is that it is perpetual, enduring as long as the reign of Christ. Therefore, this passage must be so construed as to harmonize it with the tenor of divine instruction on the Abrahamic covenant. The Bible must expound this passage, and not this passage the Bible. But the Hebrew word translated *make a new* is frequently used of that which has been *renovated*, or to express the idea of a *new* appearance of an old thing. In this sense we have the common expression, "New moon," when it, of course, only means a new appearance; or, to use the words of Grotius, "It is the same as if you should say a *renovation*, because the moon is, as it were, renewed." This signification is especially striking in the verbal form of this

word, which every one at all acquainted with the Hebrew knows to be the ground form—the simplest state of the word. In this form it means to renew, to rebuild, as in Isaiah lxi. 4: "They shall *repair* the waste cities, the desolations of many generations." 2 Chron. xv. 8, it is said of good Asa that he "*renewed* the altar of the Lord, that was before the porch of the Lord;" xxiv. 4: "And it came to pass after this, that Joash was minded to *repair* the house of the Lord." 1 Sam. xi. 14: "Then said Samuel to the people, Come, and let us go to Gilgal, and *renew* the kingdom there." Ps. li. 12: "*Restore* unto me the joy of thy salvation." The Hebrew word translated *make a new* (covenant) in Jer. xxxi. 31, and Heb. viii. 8, is used in the passages quoted above, and many others, to express the idea of *renewing*, and *repairing*, and restoring, things that existed before, and had fallen into decay. Jeremiah therefore uttered the prediction that the days would come when God would *renew* the covenant of Abraham with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. Hebrew lexicons, in defining this word, agree with this use of it in the Scriptures. Gesenius defines the verb form of it as follows: "To be new, to polish the sword—perhaps the original idea is to shine, to glitter—to make anew—to *renew*. Especially buildings, cities, to rebuild, to repair." The Greek word used by the Seventy to translate this Hebrew word is used in the New Testament by the Saviour to express the idea of *renewing*, or reïssuing, an old commandment. John xiii. 34: "A new commandment I give unto you, That ye love one another;" and yet in Lev. xix. 18 we find

the same commandment, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," which, to say the least, embraced that which the Saviour calls a *new* commandment—so that it could not be called absolutely new; and this accounts for the expression of John in his Second Epistle and fifth verse: "Not as though I wrote a new commandment unto thee, but that which we had *from the beginning*, that we love one another." The Saviour called it a *new* commandment in the sense in which that word was used and understood by the Greeks—the renewal of an old commandment. "A new covenant," therefore, plainly means a renewed covenant. The apostle, in quoting this passage from Jer. xxxi. 31, in Heb. viii. 8, uses the Greek word *sunteleso*, and this word is defined by Parkhurst as follows: "To finish entirely, to end, to make an end of, to accomplish, perform, to complete, perfect, make." Robinson: "To bring to an end together—N. T. (1) to end together fully, to finish wholly, to complete;" and quotes this passage as an example of its meaning. The Saviour used this word on the cross, when he cried, "It is finished." Therefore, Jeremiah foretold the renewing, completing, finishing, perfecting the Abrahamic covenant which promised Christ and blessings for all nations; and its Christ, having come, while in the agonies of his atoning death exclaimed, in bitter but authoritative tones, "It is finished."

Dan. ii. 44: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom." The word here rendered "set up," in its simplest root form, means to rise, or *stand up*. Then, in the form used here, it has a causative sense: *to cause to stand* up—that is,

raise up—and its common meaning in the Scriptures is to *raise* up something that is fallen down. It is so used in Amos ix. 11: "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old." This passage is used Acts xv. 16, thus: "After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down." It is used also in this sense Isaiah xlix. 6, when, speaking of the work of Christ, the Lord said: "It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to *raise* up the tribes of Jacob, and to *restore* the preserved of Israel." In Hosea vi. 2, the word translated Dan. ii. 44 "set up" is translated: "In the third day he will *raise* us up, and we shall live in his sight." 2 Sam. xii. 17, this word is used in such connection as to make it impossible for us to not get its meaning: "And the elders of his house arose, and went to him, to raise him up from the earth." This word in Dan. ii. 44, translated "set up," does not mean to originate a kingdom, but to cause a kingdom already in existence, but which is in an unfortunate condition, to rise out of its misfortunes—to build again that which has fallen into decay, and cause it to prosper and to endure. Fuerst defines this word, in his great "Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon," as follows: "To rise out of misfortune, confirm, establish, reänimate, to make revive, to endure, remain, to rebuild, to restore, to erect again." The LXX. translated this Chaldee word by the Greek word *anastasei*, and the lexicons define it as follows: Parkhurst, "To rise, to cause to rise from the dead, to arise, to appear, to

stand again, to rise from a sitting or recumbent posture." This word is used in the New Testament for the resurrection of the dead; therefore it cannot mean to originate a kingdom, but to cause one already in existence to stand and to prosper. With the foregoing agrees Matt. xvi. 18: "On this rock I will build my Church." The word in the Greek translated build is *oikodomeo*, and, as defined by Liddell and Scott, means "to edify." They give this as its meaning in the New Testament. Greenfield defines it metaphorically, the sense it has in this passage, after giving as its meaning "to rebuild, renew;" "to build up, found, establish (Matt xvi. 18; Rom. xv. 20; Gal. ii. 18); to add to, augment, increase, to cause to increase in piety, cause to improve in the divine life, conduce to spiritual advantage, edify." Edify, as defined by Webster, second meaning, which is the meaning in the passage under consideration, for it is used figuratively, "2. To instruct and improve in knowledge generally, and particularly in moral and religious knowledge, in faith and holiness; to teach." When Jesus said, therefore, "On this rock I will build my Church," he expressed the ideas of rebuilding, renewing, establishing, his Church by edifying his people and causing them to increase and improve in the divine life. Consequently, Jer. xxxi. 31; Dan. ii. 44; Heb. viii. 8; and Matt. xvi. 18, are in the most perfect agreement with, and, indeed, grow out of, the Abrahamic covenant; and the condition of the Church, acting under its authority, now violating its obligations, and falling into decay, then, under the providential dealings of God, they are brought back, raised up, re-

stored, revived, built up, established, augmented, and increased. This Church is to stand till time shall be no more. The covenant God made with Abraham had its token in the flesh of children when eight days old. Circumcision was a sign of Christ, and the grace of salvation in him. Children enjoyed the grace of salvation through Christ, and were members of his body, and branches in him, the True Vine. They still hold that gracious relation to Christ, not only according to the philosophy of redemption, but according to the covenant of salvation. That covenant has never been repealed, annulled, or substituted by another. Circumcision, because a sign of Christ, had to cease; but the covenant continuing the same, and the relation of children to Christ being unchanged, and baptism now representing the grace of salvation which they receive in Christ, therefore "the baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church."

Inasmuch as the blessing of Abraham was to come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, and as Jesus Christ sent his apostles, by the commission recorded in Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, to disciple the Gentiles by baptizing them when they received the blessing of Abraham, which was righteousness, including pardon of sin and spiritual regeneration, the covenant of Abraham that promised these blessings to all families of the earth was carried into effect. Indeed, the commission was but an order to bring the Gentiles into the family of Abraham and the household of God. For the development of this thought the reader is referred to the treatise on "Infant Baptism" by the Rev. M. Evans.

THE MODE, OR ACTION, OF BAPTISM.

BY THE REV J. DITZLER.

"While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word. On the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost."—Acts x. 44, 45.

"And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."—Acts xi. 15, 16.

THE mode, or action, of "Christian baptism" is here pointed out in the most simple and pointed manner. The force and intention of the word "*with*" is settled by our text—water used as the instrument, or means, with which they were baptized. They were "baptized *with* the Holy Ghost;" it was "poured on all of them"—"on them *as on us* at the beginning." The falling of the *Spirit* on them at once reminded Peter of the promised *baptism.* In Matt. iii. 11, we read: "*I* indeed baptize you *with water* . . *he* shall *baptize* you *with* the *Holy Ghost*, and with fire." (See also Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16; John i. 15, 26, 33; Acts i. 5; xix. 4.) 1 Cor. xii. 13: "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." The action of the Spirit, or *mode of operation*, is called pouring, "shed forth;" Titus iii. 5–7, "shed on us," etc. When inspiration gives us the mode, or action, it is ALWAYS by *affusion.* It is constantly

the action of the Spirit, represented as "an *unction*," "an *anointing*," 1 John ii. 20, 27; 1 Cor. i. 21. It is represented as a *sealing*, 2 Cor. i. 22; Eph. i. 13; iv. 30. The sealing is by anointing us with the Spirit, as the above texts show. To those who urge that in the Greek it reads "*in* the Spirit," "*in* water" ("*en*," *en hudati* in Greek), we reply, 1. It occurs sometimes, and sometimes it does not; it is as often left out as it occurs. 2. Even where it occurs (*en*) it is rightly rendered *with*, as hundreds of passages in the Greek show. 3. It is often rendered *with* in the New Testament, while it is in the Greek of the Old Testament where we have "with" times out of number. 4. The inspired word shows us its true force by telling us what the *mode was* where "*en*" occurs—"was *poured*, shed forth, fell on us;" they were *thereby baptized* WITH the Holy Spirit, and the contrast drawn: "*I* baptize *with* WATER, *he* shall baptize you *with* the HOLY GHOST."

This brings up a verse relied on by "immersionists" to refute this (John iii. 5), "*born* of water and of the Spirit." They insist this implies *envelopment*, and a proceeding out of that element, as if the spiritual birth were exactly by the process of natural birth. But, 1. The Greek word rendered born *is not modal*. It is rendered, in all its occurrences, save *one*, by the better word, "begotten," "beget," by A. Campbell, Anderson, in his new version, and other translators. The same word is rendered in our common version, beget—begotten—hundreds of times. 2. Instead of implying, as in natural birth, proceeding from *within* to the *without*, it is just the *reverse*, for it is "born of *water and* of the *Spirit*."

Now, to be born, or begotten, of the Spirit is to be brought under its influence—have it "*poured*" on us, not proceed *out* of it. Hence, to be born of the Spirit (the Greek is "begotten") is to have it "shed on us abundantly." (Titus iii. 5–7.) So to be begotten of the water is to have it shed on us in baptism. 3. The Jews were familiar with the phrase, "*born* of circumcision," begotten; *i. e.*, receive the ordinance, be brought under its influence as an ordinance. The outward symbol had, since Moses, been associated with the inward work. (Num. xix. entire; Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Isa. i. 9–16; Ps. li. entire.) 4. Christ here clearly speaks of the Jewish ablution, which was by affusion, and not of Christian baptism or its necessity; for verse 10, "Art thou a master of Israel, and *knowest not these things* (in verses 4–7)?" shows that Nicodemus, as an expounder of the Old Testament, ought to have clearly understood all he taught in verses 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. Christ lets Nicodemus know he "*must* be born (*anothen*) *from above.*" The word *never* means again, as all scholars now agree. Your own writings show, the Mosaic code demands, that to enjoy (*idein, see, enjoy, the benefits of*) the kingdom of God you must receive the outward washing and inward reality. You have relied on the outward sign; you must have the *inward reality*, as your prophets also testify. (Ezek. xxxvi. 25; Isa. lii. 15; etc.) The three thousand baptized on Pentecost, the five thousand the next day, the jailer, Lydia, and others, as those in the house of Cornelius, are clearly against the idea of immersion. Had they gone in search of water, it would have been named. Surely, in so

many cases, the baptisms occurring within a period of sixty-six years, especially thirty years of history given in The Acts, they would have recorded some clear cases of search for water in which to baptize. The element seems never to have been wanting. In a country so dry that every rill, well, and spring in it has a name and a history, where water was and is so scarce that wells were embraced in compacts and covenants, surely it was not at hand in such quantities as immersion implies. "Can any man forbid water" (Acts x. 47) clearly implies "to be brought" for the baptismal service. In John iii. 34 a clear allusion is made to the instrument John used in pouring the water on the candidates. He had been baptizing, speaking of how *Christ* should "*baptize with the Holy Spirit;*" "for God giveth not the Spirit (*ek*) *out of a measure*"—by measure, it reads in James.

But, says the objector, we *have* just the records you speak of; we have it recorded that they did go in search of water in which to baptize; so you must give up that point. Let us see. Where is the record? In Acts viii. 36: "They came unto a certain water." But were they seeking it? or did they come to it by chance, on the journey entered on before baptism was thought of? Clearly the latter. The eunuch had to call Philip's attention to the water they came to. Well, then, "they *both* went down *into* the water—both came up out of the water;" *that* was immersion. Not so. If "into" and "out of" imply immersion, *both* were immersed. O but Philip *had* to go in to immerse him. Indeed! Then, you first assume immersion; second, you are

foreed to admit one went "into" and came "out of" the water unimmersed. If one could "go down into" and "come up out of the water" unimmersed, so could the other. In Josh. iv. 16–20: "Out of Jordan;" "came *up out of Jordan*" (*ek*, out of, is the Greek, also), oecurs four times, where some three millions of people "eame up out of Jordan," yet no one was immersed. They were on dry land "in the midst of Jordan."

Well, then, this brings us to the *Jordan*, and they went there to be immersed—to get water enough. Perhaps not. 1. The "in Jordan" simply indicates the *place* of John's baptism—the "with water" tells the *mode*. John i. 28: "These things were done in Bethabara *beyond* Jordan, where John was baptizing"—*i. e.*, at this time. Bethabara is a false reading, and is not found in any ancient version or copy of the Bible—manuscript. Hence Alex. Campbell, Anderson, of his Church, and the Bible Union, follow the ancient Greek eopies—Latin and Syriae—and read Bethany. Origen eould not find the Bethany, and took it out of the text and substituted Bethabara, "place of the ford." John, then, baptized "in *Bethany*." It was "beyond Jordan." John x. 40, 42: "And went away again beyond Jordan *into the place* where John *at first* baptized; and *there* he abode. . . And many believed on him *there*." "The plaee," then, where John at first baptized was "away beyond Jordan;" Christ *dwelt* there; people "believed on him there." Was *all* this *in* Jordan? Did Christ live in the water? Was Bethany *in* Jordan? This was before the great multitude eame on. John baptized at some place

that was "away beyond Jordan," called Bethany. The multitude then came on, when it was fully noised abroad that a prophet at last, after centuries of darkness, had appeared. As Jews had to wash every day, and cleanse much of their furniture, and were commanded by Mosaic as well as Rabbinic law to use *running* water if possible, it is evident that John left Bethany and came to the Jordan solely to be where all the multitude of people and animals could be accommodated with water for all purposes. As soon as the rush was over, Ænon near Salim furnished enough for the remnant, and the lower Jordan being an unhealthy valley, he retired from it to a place of sufficient waters to meet the demands of all who came. Methodist camp-meetings, great gatherings of all kinds that call together but a few thousand people and animals, are always at a place of "much water" for these reasons. According to the original, Elijah "dwelt in a brook" —armies encamped in rivers, went "out of" seas, etc. John baptized, first, in Bethany—*place*—*with* water as *instrument*; secondly, he baptized in Jordan as the place, *with* water as the *instrument;* thirdly, he baptized "*in* Ænon" as the place, *with* water as the *instrument.* Christ dwelt *in* the place—went "*into* the *place* where John at first baptized"—"*there* he *abode.*" (John x. 40–42.) The average fall of the Jordan where John baptized is over ten feet to the mile; that of the Mississippi is not *five inches.* The stream is remarkable for coldness, coming so swiftly from regions of snow and ice in Lebanon, most of the way running through deep defiles, with walls of rocks on each side, till it gets into the plains

below. It is simply a physical impossibility for a man to stand waist-deep in such a stream as long as immersionists make John to stand there, and live. No mortal could do it. Secondly, it was a physical impossibility for him to put people under such a current as that, and continue it. We do not deny that one man may immerse another, or himself, there; but to follow it constantly for months, especially as long as John baptized before he went to Ænon, is simply impossible. Questions of decency and the like we leave to the reader. In Christ's baptism (Matt. iii. 16; Mark i. 10), our version made by immersionists violated the Greek, to favor their idea, where they make Christ come "up straightway out of the water." In the Greek it is *apo*, not *ek*, and it *never* means "out of" in a single instance in the thousands of places where it occurs, as modern scholarship has demonstrated and our immersion friends now admit. Hence Dr. Conant and Anderson render it "up *from* the water." *Apo* cannot apply to a case of emergence; hence Christ was not under water when baptized. Finally, it is very inconsistent for immersionists to contend that John went to Jordan and Ænon to get water enough to immerse, then affirm that there was water enough for that purpose in every house in all Palestine; for when we press them about the Jews who baptized themselves every day, and nearly all their utensils and furniture (see Mark vii. 4, 8; Luke xi. 38; Heb. ix. 10, where the Greek is *baptidzo*—baptize—for "*wash*"), they say that there were arrangements in all houses, and convenient places everywhere, for immersion. But when driven from the Jordan, there is one more word re-

lied on, and they say that Paul has settled the matter by saying baptism is a "*burial.*" We know how people are buried. They are placed in the grave and *covered* over, and *then* they are buried. So we are said (Rom. vi. 3, 4; Col. ii. 12) to be buried when baptized. This settles the mode, or action.

To this we reply: 1. It does not say baptism is a burial. 2. The burial is a *result of* baptism, and not the baptism or its mode. It is an *effect of* it. 3. The action is either a spiritual one or a literal, physical one. If the latter, as immersionists demand, it reads, "Baptized—*i. e.*, immersed—into Jesus Christ;" hence they were all enveloped in Christ's physical body as physical men, as we see men plunged into water. This being both ridiculous and absurd, it is clearly a *spiritual* baptism—"baptized *into Jesus* Christ;" the effect is "*into his death.*" The *result* is a "*burial.*" "*Therefore*—*i. e.*, *because* baptized *into his death*—we ARE buried by (the) baptism *into death*," not into the *water.* We *are* buried—the effect continues. It is *by* crucifixion, not *immersion.* (Verse 6.) It is the same as 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11: "*Always* bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord. For we which live are *alway* delivered (baptized) (*eis*) *into* death." It is the same in the Greek as Rom. vi., only there it is *baptized*—here "*delivered.*" "I die daily"—"conformed to his death" is the same. 4. The baptism is called circumcision, Col. ii. 11, 12: "Ye are circumcised with *the circumcision made without hands*, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh *by the circumcision* of Christ: buried with him in baptism." This shows that it is the spirit-

ual baptism by which the body of the sins of the flesh are cleansed away that Paul speaks of and calls "circumcision made without hands." Immersion is not so effected. 5. The baptism and consequent burial of which Paul speaks he urges in both places as absolute and infallible proof of our death to sin and life to holiness. But no body of Christians on earth holds that water baptism is proof of this. Hence they cannot believe consistently that Paul held that water baptism was proof of the life described in Rom. vi. and Col. ii. 10–19. These are but a few of the facts that show that no allusion is here had to water baptism. In the Greek the word is not modal at all. The word translated buried is rendered embalm repeatedly. It is applied to *any* disposal of the dead, whether burnt on funeral piles, scaffolds, or laid on a shelf in a cave or grave. It does not involve mode at all.

A very clear contrast is drawn between immersion, as such, and baptism by Paul. In Ex. xiv. 19–26; xv. 1–10, we learn that the Hebrews, computed at some three millions of souls, passed over the Red Sea "dry shod." Not one of them was immersed—dipped—plunged. Paul says (1 Cor. x. 2) they were all *baptized.* It is asserted that *while in* the sea the cloud stood over them, and they were *then* under the cloud, and "were, *as it were*, immersed." The cloud, fog, and sea formed a covering and surrounding—enveloped them. To this we reply: Ex. xiv. 19–22 states distinctly that this was not the case, but the cloud removed, "and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face and *stood behind them;* and it came *between* the camp of the Egyp-

tians and the camp of Israel," etc. It was *after* the cloud stood behind them that (verse 21) "Moses stretched out his hand over the sea; and the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea *dry land*," etc. After this (verse 22), the Israelites passed over on "*dry ground.*" They were under the cloud as it passed —removed from before them and passed to their rear to keep back the enemy, not while in the sea. Hence David's words may here apply (Ps. lxviii. 9; lxxvii. 17): "The clouds poured out water;" and lxxviii. 23. The baptism *was not* by *dipping*, *plunging*, or *immersion*. They were not *overwhelmed*. Hence it had to be by the *application of the element* to the millions baptized. But the contrast is perfect. The Egyptians were "overwhelmed"—were immersed —all of them. The Hebrew and Greek read they were *immersed;* so the Latin. The original says the Egyptians were *immersed*. (Ex. xv. 5, 10.) That is, the literal Hebrew and Greek. Not one of them was baptized. Not one of the Israelites was immersed; they were all baptized.

This brings us to a careful notice of the words used. We are often berated for not translating the original word for baptize by an English word instead of *Anglicizing* the Greek word. We ask, Is immerse an English word in any sense that baptize is not? Is it not pure Latin Anglicized, compounded of *in*, put "in" for euphony, and *mergo*, *to sink?* Its literal meaning and English is sink. This they admit. Well, now, is baptism accomplished—can Christian baptism be accomplished—by sinking, or sinking in? *No one can be baptized by immersion.* It is

an abuse of words to say *baptism* by immersion, though often done. *Emersion* must take place before the subject is baptized. Hence immersion—"sinking in"—cannot by any possibility be the representative of baptism in the New Testament. It is only a *part* of the *action* by which the person is sought to be baptized. There is that in Christian baptism, in the word baptism in the Bible, that neither dip, plunge, immerse, sprinkle, pour, as such, can set forth. Hence the specific words in Greek for these actions are never used for the ordinance in the New Testament; but pour and sprinkle are given as the *action* merely of the ordinance. While a person is under water he is *immersed*—not baptized, though; when he *comes out* he *is not immersed*, but *is baptized*. Hence it is absurd to render it by immersion, or any other word of mere action. We cannot examine many of the texts that throw light on this subject, but must examine one more ere we pass to the linguistic arguments. Heb. ix. 10: Speaking of "the tabernacle," "which stood in meats and drinks, and divers *washings*"—*baptisms*. In the Greek it is divers *baptisms*—*baptismois*. Now, what were those *diaphorois*, different kinds of baptisms? for the word only applies to things differing *in kind*, *form*, etc. Paul tells us, following the record as found in Moses, Num. xix. 9–22. It is stated by Paul in what they consisted, Heb. ix. 13, 14, 19–21: "*For* —here he assigns reasons—if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes [*i. e.*, water mixed with ashes] of a heifer *sprinkling* the *unclean*, sanctifieth to the *purifying of the flesh*," etc. Then he narrates (verses 19–22) how it was done. It is contended that the

"bath," or *washing*, cleansed; but Paul says it was the *sprinkling* in so many words. The record he follows (Num. xix.) shows this; for when he is *not* purified the reason is given. (Num. xix. 12, 13, *sq.*) 1. Verse 12: "He shall *purify* himself *with it* ("water of sprinkling") on the *third* day." This all agree was by sprinkling. Paul says the sprinkling sanctified "to the *purifying of* the *flesh*." 2. If cut off for impurity—for being "defiled"—verse 13 of Num. xix. tells us it was "*because the water* of separation was not sprinkled upon him." See, also, verses 17–19. 3. (John ii. 6): The water-pots of stone holding "two or three firkins apiece"—about six gallons—"*after the* manner of *the purifying of the Jews*." That they did not immerse in those jars, all will agree. Yet they *purified* themselves with that water. It was by sprinkling. 4. The Targums, especially of Ben Jonathan, on Num. xix. 12, 13, show that the Jews held that the purification was *effected* by the *sprinkling;* the after-washing with unmixed water—running water symbolized the *accomplishment* of ceremonial purification—that blood alone accomplished an atonement and made *pure*. Some were sprinkled with blood, others with blood and water, others with ashes of a red heifer in water—hence they were not *pollois*, or *pleiosi*, *many*, different as to times, or, as Alex. Campbell says, "on *divers* occasions," but *diaphorois* "*many sorts* of baptisms"—such as Paul goes on to describe. In a word, Paul tells us what they were—all *these* by sprinkling, not one by immersion.

But the washings of the tabernacle and of the temple were not immersions, but accomplished by

affusion. We and the "immersionists" are agreed as to the following facts: (1) The *lavers* in the temples held the water for the washing of the priests; (2) that the words wash, bathe, etc., are used to represent the Greek *louo*, *nipto*, *pluno*, the Hebrew *rachats;* (3) that the Greek words *baptismos*, *baptidzo*, etc., applied to these washings. They were *baptisms*, and called so by Mark, Luke, and Paul, as well as by the writers generally. (See Alex. Campbell's "Christian Baptism," pp. 166, 7; 174, 176, 7, 197; "Ch. Baptist," vol. v., p. 401, etc.) He says Paul more than once alludes to the laver washing, and once calls it "Christian immersion."

Now, 1. The Greek reads they washed—shall wash —*ek*—*out of* it, not *in* it. Ex. xxx. 18–21; xl. 30, 31 —*ex autou*—wash out of it—the laver of the tabernacle. 2. They dared not immerse in it any part of themselves. By the law (Num. xix. 21, 22; Lev. x. 34; xv. 34–36; and Rabbinic law; Lightfoot, "Horæ Heb. et Tal." ii. 417), if anyone unclean, one needing purification, even *touched* any object, it became defiled. If he touched water, it was unclean, and could not be used. Hence, though they washed *out of* the laver—*i. e.*, with the water as it came out of the apertures about its base, baptized—yet no one ever dared dip even his finger *in* it. 3. The basin in the temple so used was from nine to twelve feet deep. It was placed several feet above the floor. It held, says Dr. Gale, the great immersionist of Europe, "*one thousand barrels of water.*" Now, if one dipped himself, or any part of himself, in it, the whole was rendered impure, and would have to be poured out, the vessel cleansed seven

days, then refilled. But it had to be used constantly. For an account of this laver, see 2 Chron. iv. 1–14; 1 Kings vii. 23–40. The former laver served the purpose of this one and the ten small ones. These facts show that their daily baptisms were by affusion. 4. Had anyone gone through the Quixotic *feat* of bounding up fifteen or sixteen feet to catch on the lofty brim, and rolled into it, it being over nine feet deep, good swimming alone would save life, all decency and solemnity aside. 5. History all testifies that they had cocks, or apertures, at the base, which allowed the effusion of water for the baptismal service, which shows why Josephus uses the word wash and sprinkle interchangeably, or alternately, when speaking of it. Hence the baptisms performed daily at the laver of the tabernacle, at that of Solomon's Temple, and its successor, through fourteen hundred years, were all by affusion—none by immersion.

The Jews baptized at fountains for purification, as we learn also in Judith xii. 7, where Judith baptized herself (*epi*) at the "fountain of water." It was in the midst of a camp where "guards of soldiers were placed over the fountains." Here immersion is excluded both by decency and by the words and grammar of the language.

But the exclusive immersionists have for centuries virtually admitted that our common version, though it was made by immersionists when "dipping" was the law of the land, and had been for centuries, and remained so for over a century and a half, is rather undecided, and hence they have gone to the original to determine this question.

The immersionists insist that the word is Greek —to be determined by Greek usage; that its primary and only proper meaning is to immerse, dip, plunge, overwhelm; that when it means "to wash" it is as a *consequence* of immersion—a derivative meaning, and not literal, and implies immersion always; that this is proved (1) by the unanimous testimony of all lexicographers, especially the most noted ones; (2) by the admissions of critics and scholars of all parties; (3) by the occurrences and grammatical relations of the words with other words; (4) by the unanimous testimony of all ancient versions, or translations; that this latter source is especially decisive, because the versions were made in the earliest times by the ablest and most learned men in the world, and when they knew by living witnesses what the apostolic practice was. In a discourse as brief as this must be we cannot examine the second and third positions above, because far less important than the other two, especially as they are largely involved in the first assertion as to lexicons. They also say all this is confirmed by the early fathers and present practice of oriental Churches.

We simply say that in quoting critics and scholars, unfortunately, at least ninety-five out of every hundred of them, such as Beza, Witsius, Buddæus, Terretinus, Lightfoot, Leigh, Castellus, Kühnöl Luther, Wesley, Clarke, etc., are garbled, misquoted, and wholly misrepresented, as we know, and have shown in other works. Hence we will mainly restrict our inquiries now to (1) the true meaning of the word; (2) the lexicons; (3) the ver-

sions, as these are by far the most important sources of information, by common consent of all parties.

Assuming *immersion* (*sinking in*) as the primary idea of the Greek word *baptidzo*, and as therefore the radical meaning of the root, or stem-word, no law of philology can give any thing approaching a reason why it should take on the meaning of *wash*, not to name the other meanings it evidently has. We select *wash*, because all their authorities, all immersionists, agree that its *derivative* meaning is to wash. This will not bear investigation. They say, "A thing is dipped that it may be washed, cleansed" —hence it comes to mean wash, because the immersion is implied in "the *washing*." As absolute refutation of this, 1. There is no connection between wash and immerse. To immerse is to sink any object. There is no essential connection at all between the two words. Rocks, animals, logs, etc., sink when they are soaked, wet, or made muddy—not washed. 2. Immersion does not even imply a cleansing element. It may be immersed in blood, wine, milk—in ink, in dye, in filth. Hence, 3. In some languages, as the Arabic and Hebrew, the same word that radically implies immersion, means to defile, make filthy. 4. No instance has been, or can be, produced in any language connected with Hebrew, Greek, or English, where either *wash* or *cleanse* is derived from a word that primarily meant to immerse, or that *properly* means to immerse. Take the Latin *mergo*, *immergo*, *submergo*, *demergo*; the Greek *kataduo*, *pontidzo*, *katapontidzo*, *buthidzo*; the Hebrew *tabhal*, or *tamal*, which Gesenius insists means primarily to immerse; the Arabic *gamara*,

ghatasa, etc.; or the Anglieized Latin, immerse: *in no instance* does this word "immerse" in all these tongues—occurring tens of thousands of times—*ever mean* to wash, nor is it so defined by any lexieon we ever saw. Is it not wonderful, then, that a proposition is assumed as *true* that is shown to be utterly false by such a erushing demonstration? 5. On the contrary, in Greek, at least four different words mean to wash, as all admit, yet they *never* mean to immerse—*louo*, *pluno*, *nipto*, *kludzo*. The Latin *lavo*, *luo*, the Hebrew *rachats* and *kabas*, never mean to immerse, and no lexieon on earth so defines them. So of the German *baden*, *waschen*.

It is redueed to an impossibility, then, that wash should be derived from immerse; but they all agree that *wash* is derived from *baptidzo*. Henee *baptidzo* eannot primarily mean to immerse. But if we now assume *sprinkle* as the primary meaning, will the laws of philology and true science sustain it, and harmonize all the faets involved? We are bold to say they will, and with overwhelming force. 1. Then, a great number of words that all admit mean to sprinkle, mean to *wash*. 2. A great many words that primarily mean to sprinkle, to moisten, to bedew, to irrigate (when it is by affusion—sprinkling, pouring), mean to wash, to immerse; and as *baptidzo* is admitted to mean immerse in classie Greek, where, by the way, it never means *to wash*, we see how a word ean primarily mean to moisten where mode is not eontemplated, and where the moistening is aecomplished by the falling of tears, rain, dew, sprinkling with blood, water, ete., and ultimately mean to overwhelm, dip, or immerse.

3. The words that most commonly mean *to wash* in all the languages in which the Bible was first written, and in which it was first translated, most generally mean also to sprinkle or pour; while not one of the words commonly meaning to wash in the languages in which the inspired penmen wrote God's word is defined immerse, or its equivalent, by any lexicon we ever saw (and we have examined more, perhaps, than any living man), yet almost every one of the best and highest standards of them all define the words for wash by to sprinkle or pour, or both. THEY ALL DO SO WHENEVER MODE IS GIVEN.

In the first and second instances, out of many, we select *tengo*, *deuo*, *brecho*, in Greek, as well as *ballo*, *emballo*. Pickering, Groves, Liddell and Scott, or, more elaborately, "Stephens's Greek Thesaurus" and "Passow's Lexicon," will show the truth of this; while *brecho* means "to wet, moisten, sprinkle, rain on—shower down"—(Liddell and Scott) "wet, moisten, sprinkle, be wet with rain," etc. (Passow), yet it means, like *baptidzo* in classic Greek—where it is *never* used in any religious sense, and never for an ordinance—"to be drunk," "overwhelm." It means, also, "to dip," "soak;" and with "*en*" Stephens renders it immerse as well as to sprinkle, "plunge," pour, rain. *Deuo* is "bedew," "shed," "sprinkle," "wet," "akin to our *dew*," yet "Pickering's Lexicon" gives it "to dye by immersion or sprinkling, to pour out, to shed, cause to flow," while "Liddell and Scott's Lexicon" gives "soak," "steep," as if *baptidzo*. Stephens, Passow, and other great authors, put *enduo* as equivalent to *bapto*, the root of *baptidzo* as well as *embrecho*—both

constantly meaning to shed, as of tears, rain, dew. The Latin *tingo*, *madeo*, *madefacio*, illustrate it, while the Hebrew is full of illustrations. We have examined a great number of words in Hebrew, Arabic, and their cognates, that primarily imply to sprinkle, to moisten, to bubble, or sparkle, that come to imply dipping, immersing. *Chamats*, *balala*, *letash*, and *shataph*, will suffice. *Chamats* Castell gives, in his "Pentaglotton," to sprinkle, moisten, etc.; then "to stain, dip, immerse." Schindler gives, like Castell, among other meanings, "to sprinkle, soften, moisten, make wet, wash, *dip*, *penetrate into*." Buxtorf: *Chamats* — "be sprinkled (*conspersus*); then *tinctus*, *infectus*." He gives, under *letash*, sharpen; secondly, sprinkle (*secundo*, *spargere*); then "*asperget vel immerset*"—sprinkle or immerse. *Balal*, *balala*, which all authorities give as perfuse, sprinkle, pour, means to dip derivatively, and is the word in the Arabic translation for dip. Luke xvi. 24: "That he may dip the end of his finger;" John xiii. 26: "When I shall have dipped." It is rendered from *bapto*, the root of *baptidzo*.

We could give a long table of words that have sprinkle as their radical, others moisten, wet, as the prevailing meaning, that come to mean to wash, others that come to mean to dip, soak, immerse, inundate, or overwhelm. All this shows that all the laws of philology, and the history and science of words in all languages, demonstrate the fact that immerse, dip, or plunge, could not have been the radical meaning of *baptidzo*, but that "to sprinkle, to moisten," and that even in the slightest manner—

e. g., by sprinkling—was its primary meaning. It is urged that *bapto*, the root, meant to immerse, then to dye, stain, because you immerse to dye, or stain; but the same words that properly and always mean, or imply, immersion do not mean to dye, or stain. Hence it is false philology. Again, there is no *essential* connection between immersion and staining, or even dyeing; for while you *may* immerse in a dyeing element, you may immerse, and things oftener are immersed, *in elements* that do not stain, or dye—nay, in elements that *erase* stains. Nor is it reasonable, or historical, that the first discovery of staining, painting, or dyeing, was that by immersion; nor do the words in different languages for dye, stain, ever have immerse as their first meaning, and in nearly all cases they *never* mean to immerse. On the contrary, it can be both historically and philologically shown that the first idea of staining, coloring, or dyeing, was that done by effusion, dropping, or spurting, of the element on the matter, or object, colored. From discovering the effect of drops of grapes, or shell-insects, certain vines, etc., when broken, came the art of coloring partially; then, of preparing the element, diluting water with it, and dipping suddenly into it; then, of immersing in it, to give a deeper and more permanent color. Hence here, again, we see the reasonableness of the position that sprinkle is the primary meaning of the word; and as in law, and theology, and medicine, words retain their primary meaning far better and longer than anywhere else, and take on wholly new meanings in popular, or what becomes classic, literature, we see the infinite difference between *bap-*

tidzo in the Bible and *baptidzo* in classic Greek. 1. In classic Greek it never means to wash; in the Bible it means to wash, and all admit it. 2. In classic Greek it never applies to religion; in the Bible it always so applies. 3. In classic Greek it never applies to any ordinance; in the Bible it always so applies. 4. In classic Greek it never implies the bringing of the subject out of the element —always, so far as the word goes, leaves the object under the element where it put it; in the Bible it never does, if it ever implies "putting under." 5. In classic Greek it contemplates nothing but a single act; in the Bible it always implies much more. 6. In classic Greek it is never symbolic; in the Bible *all* admit it is so.

Again, other words that mean primarily to sprinkle in various tongues, mean also to stain, defile, color, dye—*e. g.*, *spargo* in Latin, *moluno* in Greek, whose primary meaning, Stephens notes, was to sprinkle (*conspergere*).

Once more, and we think, with crushing weight, we return to *wash*, as connected with *baptidzo*. Let the careful reader examine A. Campbell's "Christian Baptism," his maturest and greatest work, as his own people regard it, pages 166, 7, 174–7, 197; "Ch. Baptist," vol. v., page 401, etc., and see his statements about wash; or "The Louisville Debate" of Wilkes and Ditzler, 225, 605, 6, etc. All immersionists contend that the word wash, as a constant New Testament meaning of *baptidzo*, implies immersion. They are a unit here. They say the washing prescribed in Moses's law for persons was always by immersion. Carson, Conant, Gale, Fraser, Ingham,

A. Campbell, and all their adherents, agree here. Now, aside from what we have shown against this view—and it is utterly ruinous to the assumption—we add the following facts:

I. The Hebrew word for washing the person, in the cases supposed, is *rachats*. 1. No lexicon on earth defines it to dip, or immerse, or plunge. 2. All that give it any *modal* meaning, give it sprinkle, or pour. 3. First, the greatest of all Hebrew lexicographers, and a Rabbi, after "wash," adds this: "to flow, to pour out, to drip." 4. It is the word used where Joseph *washes his face*. (Gen. xliii. 30.) 5. The Targum of Jonathan renders it "washed his face with his tears." 6. It is the same root with, and equivalent of, *rachash*, "to pour." 7 It is never translated immerse, dip, or plunge, in any version we ever saw. 8. It is translated by the version used by the apostles "*pour*," *cheo*. 9. It is used for the washing prescribed where only a little over the one-fifth of a pint of water was used for the washing.

II. *Rachats* is translated *nipto*, "wash," often in the version used by the apostles. *It* never means to dip or immerse; it does mean to perfuse. It applies to the falling rain in the Bible. Again, *rachats* is rendered by the Greek *louo* frequently; but no lexicon renders *louo* by immerse—the best in the world render it pour and sprinkle whenever they give it a *modal* definition, such as the uncorrupted and all English editions of Liddell and Scott, Stephens, and Galen, a native Greek. See, also, Passow under *ballo*, where, referring to *loutron* (the noun for washing, from *louo*), he says *sich mit bade-wasser besprengen*—to besprinkle oneself with bath-water.

On the Latin *lavo*, wash, which is the constant translation of *baptidzo* by all New Testament lexicographers, Schiller and Luenemann, Leverett, Freund, and Ainsworth—the recognized standards in Latin—all give sprinkle, or besprinkle, as a meaning; not one ever gives dip or immerse.

We could extend these facts indefinitely, but have given even here the fullest detail of facts by far we have even seen on this part of the subject. In the face of all this, who can consistently contend that, though *wash* is a constant Bible meaning of *baptidzo*, yet it is because *immersion* is implied in it? They say, If you sprinkle a cloth is it *washed?* We ask, If you simply dip it, is it washed? especially, Is it *washed* if *dipped* in ink? The argument from philology is then wholly against the immersion theory, and demonstrates affusion as the proper mode.

We have space only to examine briefly the direct testimony of lexicons and the ancient versions: 1. Julianus, the most erudite of all the opponents of Augustin, fourth century, says, "It means to sprinkle," "*baptidzo—perfundere interpretatus est.*" ("Beza's Annot. Gr. T.," Matt. iii.) 2. The learned Augustin restricts this to its religious use, and urges that only as a religious word is it "thus to be understood." 3. Tertullian, of the second century, says it means "not only to plunge, or immerse, but also to sprinkle." ("De Anima," Pond, 25.) 4. Grimshaw: "To wash, to dip, besprinkle." 5. Ed. Robinson, latest editions, states that "in Helenistic usage, it would seem to have expressed the more general idea of *ablution*, or *affusion*." 6. Kouma, the learned Greek who composed a classic

lexicon for *modern* Greeks on the *ancient* Greek, defines it thus: "To sink (*buthidzo*), to put any thing frequently into water, to besprinkle, to shed forth, or moisten (*brecho*); (2) to draw or pump water; (3) in an ecclesiastical sense, to baptize." 7. Gazes, the most learned of all modern Greek *natives*, defines it thus: "To put any thing frequently into, or in the midst of, a thing, and thence upon (or in behalf of) it; to shed forth any thing, to water, to pour upon (*epichuno*), to wash," etc. 8. Schwarzius: "To baptize, immerse, to overwhelm, to dip into, to wash by immersing; sometimes to sprinkle, to besprinkle, to pour upon." 9. Wahl's "Clavis," 2d ed., 1831, 1836: (1) "Immerse [Josephus, Polybius]—*i. e.*, classic use—properly also concerning the sacred immersion, etc.; then immersion . . with the idea of *burying* included; to sprinkle (*perfundo*), followed with the dative of the instrument, etc.; (2) for *nipto*, I wash." His *first* edition reads: "(1) I wash, (2) I immerse," etc. 10. Liddell and Scott, ed. 1850 (changed since by the Bible revision—immersion—influence): "To dip repeatedly, to dip under, to bathe; hence to steep, wet, metaphorically, soaked in wine; to pour upon, etc.; to baptize, N. T." 11. Suicer's "Thesaurus" (*per immersionem aut aspersionem*): "By immersion or sprinkling." 11. Schneider: "To dip in, dip under; then, as the Greek *brecho* (which means to wet, shed forth, sprinkle, rain, bedew; then soak, rarely immerse), wash," etc. 12. Schoettgenius: "Properly, to plunge, immerse; (2) to wash, cleanse; (3) baptize, to pour forth largely." 13. Stokins, the greatest of all New Tes-

tament lexicographers, in A. Campbell's estimation: "I wash, I baptize," etc. In his note on its classic as well as the sacred use, he says: "Generally, and by the force of the word, it obtains the notion of dipping, or immersing. (2) Specially—properly it is to immerse, or dip in water. Tropically, (1) by a metalepsis it is to wash, to cleanse, because a thing is accustomed to be dipped in water that it may be washed, or cleansed; although also the washing, or cleansing, may be, *and generally is, accomplished by sprinkling the water* (*adspergendo aquam*). (Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 38.) Hence transferred to the sacrament of baptism. (3) By metaphor, it designates the miraculous pouring out of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles and other believers, as on account of the abundance of the gifts of the Spirit, since anciently the water was poured copiously upon those baptized, or they were immersed deep in the water," etc. 14. Schleusner, the standard of New Testament and sacred Greek lexicographers: "Properly, to immerse, or dip, to plunge into water, from *bapto*, and answers to the Hebrew *tabal*, 2 Kings v. 14, in the Alex. Version, and to *taba*, in Symmachus, Ps. lxviii. 5, and in one uncertain (as to the translator), Ps. ix. 6; *but in this sense it never occurs in the New Testament*, but very frequently in the Greek (classic) writers: see Diodorus Siculus, of the overflowing of the Nile, Strabo, etc.; (2) to wash, to cleanse, to purify with water. Thus it occurs in the New Testament. (4) Metaphorically, to imbue, to give, or administer to, copiously, to pour forth abundantly." 15. We close with the acknowledged standard of all Greek lexicons—the most critical and careful ever

made, and now made the basis of all others—"Passow by Rost:" "*Baptidzo* (from *bapto*), (1) oft and repeatedly to dip, dip under, thence to moisten, wet, to sprinkle, *hoi ebaptismenoi*, made drunk, soaked with wine. Generally, to pour upon, pour over, overwhelm, etc.; (3) *baptize*, to bathe, to wash."

Of how these authors have been misquoted, garbled, abused, we could say a great deal, but forbear now for want of space. Note, 1. That no lexicon sustains the immersion theory. 2. No one says immerse was the radical, or *primary*, meaning of *baptidzo*. 3. They all agree that immerse—*i. e.*, sink, soak, make drunk—are its *prevailing* classic meanings; wash, cleanse, its New Testament meaning; with sprinkle or pour as the prevailing *mode*, whenever *mode* is indicated.

We now come to the most reliable source of information that can be had, except where the Spirit gave us the mode when the inspired man saw the Spirit fall on them as it was poured out upon them, and he declared how it reminded him of the promised *baptism*, Acts xi. 15–17. But to do the subject justice, we must not forget that *baptidzo*, as a sacred word, is itself *the translation* of an older word—the Hebrew *tabal*, pronounced *tabhal*, *taval*. All parties agree that, 1. *Tabal*, the Hebrew word for *baptize*, occurs sixteen times in the Bible. 2. It is translated *bapto* repeatedly. 3. It was in all ages, and is still, used by the Jews for proselyte baptism, since such was known, generally supposed to date from the days of Jacob. 4. It is rendered *baptidzo*, 2 Kings v. 14, in the version used by the apostles. 5. It is

the translation of *rachats*, the Jewish sacred washing, in the Jewish Targums. 6. It is the oldest word, and first record of a baptism, by a thousand years. But immersionists have held seeming control of this word, and for centuries made capital out of it; but there was an utter neglect among Pedobaptists on this subject, else the other side would have been driven from the field at once. Confounding the "dip" in King James's Version, where it *never* implies total submergence, with immersion, and using only the brief manual lexicons that did not exhibit, else they did not render, the Latin in a way to see their true meaning, the truth was entirely hidden. We freely grant that Gesenius is with our opponents on this word, so far as the primary meaning goes; but his unphilosophical and, as the Germans have shown, his ephemeral and unreliable rules and arbitrary modes of fixing roots, destroy his authority here. Indeed, on this very word he utterly destroys his reputation when he makes the root to be both immerse and sprinkle—corresponding to dip and *deuo* in Greek. This we elaborately expose elsewhere.

Let us see the lexical definitions of this word from the greatest of all lexicographers, by agreement of all parties:

1. Schindler, "the greatest scholar in Christendom" in his day (E. Leigh), thus defines *tabal*, 1612, in his "Pentaglotton:" "To moisten, dip, immerse, wash: so that he washes (ceremonially), as the object is not cleansed, but merely touches the water either in whole (all over) or in part, baptize."

2. Buxtorf, "the prince" of Hebrew lexicog-

raphers in the older school when it reached its greatest perfection, till the last few years: "To moisten, dip, immerse, etc. Among the Rabbins it is used for to wash oneself—wash any thing in water. But the washing is of vessels, or of men. The washing of men could be effected by the immersion of the whole body in water. The washing of vessels had its own peculiar laws; and hence the Rabbins are very careful, and note the minutest things that pertain to effecting purification in washing, so that the thing cleansed of whatever attaches to it is not washed all over, but is merely besprinkled (or touched) with the water." (Folio Lex.)

3. Stokius's "Clavis" defines it as the rest, and adds: "Generally it has the idea of immersing. Properly, it is to dip any thing, so that it touches the water wholly or merely in part; (2) be cleansed."

4. E. Leigh's "Critica Sacra," same as Schindler, and says: "So that he washes, as the thing is not cleansed, but is merely touched by the water, either in whole or in part; to baptize."

5. Castell's "Heptaglotton," 1669. This is the most elaborate and costly lexicon ever published in the Hebrew and cognate tongues. Nineteen of the best scholars in Europe were engaged in it, aggregating three hundred years of labor. Several rabbis and natives in other oriental tongues were employed, while Lightfoot and Pocock have a large share in the same. As it defines *tabal* essentially as the rest, we give both the Latin and a translation: "*Tabal*, tinxit, intinxit, immersit (Ang. dippe, or dabble), baptizavit; differt à *rachats*, quod lotio sit ad rem mundandum; intinctio, autem rem humidam

contingat tantum, vel ex parte, vel totam. R. Dav., Gen. xxxvii. 31," etc. "To moisten, to dip, immerse (English dip, or dabble), to baptize. It differs from *rachats*, since the washing (*rachats*) is for purification. Dipping, but it merely touches the object to (or with) the moisture, either in part or wholly. R. David Kimchi," etc.

6. We reserve Fürst to the last, because he is the best Hebrew lexicographer that has ever appeared, and the most recent of great merit. His work first appeared (in folio) in Latin, then in German with no concordance attached. The definitions in Latin and German are the same—"to moisten, to wet, to sprinkle; to immerse." The translator of the German added his Latin *rigare*, *tingere*, from which developed "*immergere*," and added "*therefore*," which misled those not versed in the original. Rabbi Fürst adds: "The organic root is *bal*." "The fundamental signification of the stem (*bal*) is to moisten, besprinkle."

Here we have twenty-four of the most distinguished and able lexicographers of the ages—nineteen in Castell, and, Stokius excepted, the best that ever wrote in Hebrew—showing that if the water merely *touches* the subject, or the object is "merely touched by it," it baptizes it. The root is the same in Hebrew and Arabic, and occurs in a great number of words, in all of which is the sprinkle, moisten "with a gentle affusion." If Mr. Alex. Campbell's idea be correct, "Wherever the radical syllable is found, the radical idea is in it," then sprinkle is infallibly the radical idea of this word. Of the great number of words with the same root and radical idea as *tabal*, we have space

for but one—*balal*, Arabic *balala*. *Bal* is the root, as in *ta-bal*, *baptize*. It is defined by Castell, Schindler, Leigh, Gesenius, and the rest, "*perfudit, conspersit*" —to perfuse, sprinkle. "Freytag's Arabic Lexicon," with all the rest, gives *bal* thus: "Moisten, or macerate, by sprinkling, or gentle affusion, of water." This is the radical idea of the Hebrew of baptize.

The first place in all literature where the word occurs is Gen. xxxvii. 31: "And they took Joseph's coat, and killed the kid of the goats, and baptized the coat with the blood," etc. Our version, made by immersionists, renders it dip—*i. e.*, a mere touching of the garment to the blood. Note, 1. The object of the baptism—to deceive the father with the idea that a wild beast had slain Joseph. No wild beast in slaying a man would immerse his outward coat (*toga*, or *chitona*) in blood. Sprinkling it with blood was the natural process. 2. He knew the coat by its many colors; hence not submerged in blood. 3. It was impossible, as well as against this design, to submerge the coat of a man in the blood of the kid. 4. The Septuagint, used by the apostles, translates the word *tabal*, baptize, by *moluno*, to stain, sprinkle, of which Stephens's "Thesaurus" says: "The primitive meaning is sprinkle—*primitava notio est conspergere.*" 5. One of the Targums has it bedashed—*i. e.*, sprinkled. 6. The Peshito Syriac, best and oldest of all versions of the whole Bible, renders it *sprinkled*, for baptized.

The word occurs Ex. xii. 22, where the bunch of hyssop was to be moistened with the lamb's blood; in Lev. xiv. 6, and 49–53, where the materials bap-

tized with the blood of the dead bird could not be immersed in it; in Lev. iv. 6, 17, where the Greek is *bapto*—moisten (*apo tou haimatos*) *from*, by *means of*, the blood; immerse is out of the question here, because it was not possible—secondly, against both the Hebrew and the Greek. To sum up, 1. Of the sixteen occurrences of this word, *not once* is it immerse, nor does it imply it. 2. Several places imply a *partial dip* ("*ex parte*"), *not* one implies more. 3. In no instance of "dip" was *mode* contemplated, but the moistening or affecting of the thing *tabaled*, or baptized. 4. No Christian version of the first fifteen centuries after Christ ever rendered *tabal* by immerse, or any word that properly implied it in any instance. 5. Not one of them renders the word *immerse*, *tabha*, which does occur both in Hebrew; Ps. lxix. 3; ix. 6; Ex. xv. 4, by *baptidzo*, or by the words for *baptize;* nor does the Septuagint, used by the apostles, ever render immerse (*tabha*) by *baptidzo*, while it does render it by the Greek *enduno*, *kataduo*, *katapontidzo*, which always apply to immersion.

A critical examination of the passage which all immersion writers have quoted from Maimonides utterly destroys their own position. "Wherever in the law washing is mentioned," etc., he tells us it implies the dipping of the whole body, "and if the tip of the little finger be not dipped, he is still in his uncleanness." . "A bed that is wholly defiled, if a man dips it *part by part*, it is pure." 1. The word is not dip. 2. *Rachats* is the word used. 3. The mode is expressed by *tabal*, *shataph*, and *kabas*, neither of which implies immersion. 4. It re-

futes their theory, in that they admit it may be baptized "*part by part.*" This ruins immersion. 5. Mamionides lived more than a thousand years after Christ, and was not even a native Jew. 6. Where he is to wash all over (not dip), mode is not implied. The connection shows the main point was to have water come in contact with every part to purify it. Though the Targums are Jewish translations, yet under the head of translations in common Christian parlance is meant, after the LXX., the Christian versions after the completion, or near the completion, of the New Testament, beginning with the Old Syriac, of whose most ancient prints Cureton found the best yet known.

The Peshito Syriac, made in the apostolic age by the consent of all the ablest Syriac critics and oriental Church, and the best and most literal ever made, is all important here. 1. This and the Itala were made while the body of converts baptized in apostolic times were living. 2. Made by men baptized in the apostles' days. 3. By the most erudite men in the Church, and most influential. 4. Of all versions made, these and the others we quote stood approved by the whole Christian world in the days when the apostolic mode was perfectly understood. Let us now examine these versions especially.

I. *The Syriac.* *Baptidzo* is rendered by *amad* most commonly in all Syriac versions, especially the old one. As all the lexicons render it about the same way, we quote one for all, because it is more voluminous, and based on two lexicons made by *native* Syrians while it was yet a *living* language. 1. Cas-

tellus, equivalent to nineteen lexicographers, in his "Heptaglotton" defines *amad* thus: "Primarily, to be washed, be baptized. *Aphel* (*i. e.*, *derivatively*) to immerse; Num. xxxi. 24, to baptize." The Arabic is the same, same root, same meaning, and thus defined by him: "To baptize, make wet with rain." But the immersionists say *amat* was meant, and is the same. We grant it is the same, that *d* and *t* constantly exchange places not only in Arabic and Syriac, but in all Semitic tongues, and even in Indo-European. Hence Castell says: "The Arabic also lisps in pronunciation, *amath*, *amad*, *amat* (all same), to be immersed, to moisten (*maduit*), to sprinkle with rain (of the earth, herbs), sprinkled with rain (or dew), wet with water, also sprinkled," etc. 2. *Tabal*, with the Greek *baptidzo*, is rendered *secho*, which never implies immersion, and whose root means "flow of water," "vehement rain;" in Chaldee, "to pour out water." 3. In Susanna, 15, 17, *louo*, "to wash, pour, sprinkle," is rendered *amad*, baptize, where it was evidently by perfusion. 4. *Bapto*, the root of *baptidzo*, is rendered sprinkle, Rev. xix. 13, though some contend Revelation was made later, say middle of second century. 5. It renders baptize Gen. xxxvi. 31, by sprinkled. 6. Ps. vi. 6 (7), it reads: "I have baptized (*tzeva*) my couch with my tears." 7 Ezek. xxii. 24: "Thou art the land that is not purified"—*not baptized;* no, upon thee *the rain has not fallen*—(*metro necheth*). 8. Luke vii. 38, 44: "My feet hath she baptized with her tears" (*tzeva*). 9. In no instance does this version render baptize by immerse.

II. The *Itala* was the next best and earliest ver-

sion, made early in the second century while this matter was perfectly understood. 1. It renders *bapto* by sprinkle. 2. It never renders it dip, immerse, plunge. 3. It once renders it wash (*lavo*); it twice renders it baptize (the Chaldee *tzeva*) by to sprinkle; the Greek is *bapto*—Dan. iv; v.

III. Jerome, A.D. 380–383, is the same.

IV Æthiopic, Sahidic, and Coptic render *bapto* by to sprinkle. The Æthiopic renders *baptidzo* by to *wash*, never immerse.

V The Arabic, seventh century, renders *baptidzo* in the New Testament by three different words. 1. *Amada*, which, under the Syriac, we have seen. We leave the exploded idea that *amad* connects with the Hebrew to stand out of question as unworthy of notice now. 2. It is rendered *gasala*, Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 28; Heb. vi. 2; ix. 10. Castell thus renders *gasala:* "To baptize; to wash, wash oneself, to be perfused (*perfusus*) with moisture; to wash carefully, wash the members, wash oneself, to moisten (*maduit*), to be sprinkled, to sprinkle (*inspergit*)." It also occurs Ps. lxxiii. 13: "Wàshed my hands in innocency;" Matt. vi. 17: "Wash thy face;" and where Aaron and his sons washed, Lev. viii. 6. 3. *Baptidzo* is rendered *tsavaza* (*savaza*) many times in the New Testament. Schindler and Leigh give it "To moisten, dip, imbue or infect with color or water, to wash, moisten (or sprinkle, *madefecit*), wet, baptize, immerse." Castell: "To moisten, imbue, immerse, baptize (by immersion); to pour out (*effudit*). Fürst: "To moisten, besprinkle, to baptize. *Paal* (form) to water, to moisten." The root is *tsab*, and its radical meaning

is effusion, pouring out. All lexicons give pour, pour out, as its fundamental and prevailing meaning. See Freytag, Catafago, etc.

We have not space for the Fathers' testimony; it is not needed here now, after the above. It would be simply to pile up confirmation—no more. So of the place where the old Jew baptized himself with the particles of hail in the winter, melting enough water thus for his baptism. Luther and the Lusitanian render *bapto* by sprinkle.

Euthymius, a learned Greek Father of the fourth century, the two oldest Greek New Testaments in the world, made in the fourth century, and seven others of later date, all render *baptidzo* (Mark vii. 4) by *rantidzo*, sprinkle, because *there* it was not the holy ordinance of our Saviour, but the Jewish baptism not prescribed by divine authority. Hence they translate it in copying the Bibles, and tell us what it is, just as they did Rev. xix. 13, giving sprinkle for *bapto*. Irenæus, A.D. 185, copies *bapto*, then translates it *sprinkle* in the same line, while Hippolytus, A.D. 220, and the most learned of all Greek Fathers (Origen, A.D. 215), translate it sprinkle also. To all who are interested in the full and carefully-arranged analysis of all the facts connected with these matters, with full references to all quotations and facts, with critical details, we give reference to the work we are preparing on this subject. In a single discourse we can only give a mere sketch of a part of the facts and results.

The philology of the word and of all languages demonstrates that effusion is the most scriptural and proper mode of baptism. All lexicons sustain

this position. The word *baptize* in all ancient languages, proves it beyond cavil. All lexicography sustains this. All the ancient versions unanimously and overwhelmingly uphold affusion as most correct and apostolic. The Fathers unanimously do the same, while many of them in later days preferred immersion for superstitious reasons. We allow of immersion because the words for baptism admit of that also; and as mode is not made essential to the emblematic use of water, the *real* design of baptism is not destroyed thereby, though, we think, it is much marred. Certainly its solemnity is lessened, and its perfect representation of the Holy Spirit's descent upon the heart. Finally, *for the first fifteen hundred years of the Christian era, not a single translation of God's word ever translated the words baptidzo, baptismos*, etc., *by a word that properly, generally, or primarily meant to immerse, dip, or plunge.*

THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM—THE DANGER OF TRIFLING WITH GOD.

BY THE REV T. F VANMETER.

"For the days shall come upon thee, that thine enemies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another; because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation."—Luke xix. 43, 44.

HERE we have presented to us a prophecy of Jesus Christ, which was most signally, and literally, and awfully fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, under Vespasian. When we read the history of this circumstance, and remember the dreadful and appalling carnage caused by it, we do not wonder that Christ wept over that proud city, when its cup of iniquity was full; for he, too, had "bowels of mercy," and, in one sense, was a man. Hear him saying, as he drew near the city, weeping, "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes." From the time of the preaching of John the Baptist to the hour he predicted the downfall and ruin of that magnificent city, with its splendid temple, offers of mercy were daily urged upon them; but they refused this mercy, and hence, the circumstantial

prophecy of Christ fully came to pass. Not one iota of the minute description recorded by Matthew failed of fulfillment; and thus we see the word of God has been fully and awfully established. In the destruction of their city, their temporal and ecclesiastical polity was destroyed, and they have been scattered to the four ends of the earth; and who but God could so signally fulfill his dreadful threatenings?

I. We notice the *prophetical* and *historical* circumstances pertaining to this subject; and then, secondly, make some *application* of it to *ourselves*.

Isaiah says: "I will camp against thee round about, and will lay siege against thee with a mount, and I will raise forts against thee. And thou shalt be brought down, and shalt speak out of the ground, and thy speech shall be low out of the dust, and thy voice shall be, as of one that hath a familiar spirit, out of the ground, and thy speech shall whisper out of the dust."

Jeremiah says: "The shepherds with their flocks shall come unto her; they shall pitch their tents against her round about; they shall feed every one in his place. Prepare ye war against her; arise, and let us go up at noon. Woe unto us! for the day goeth away, for the shadows of the evening are stretched out. Arise, and let us go by night, and let us destroy her palaces. For thus hath the Lord of hosts said, Hew ye down trees, and cast a mount against Jerusalem: this is the city to be visited; she is wholly oppression in the midst of her."

Daniel says: "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins."

And Micah says: "Therefore shall Zion for your sakes be plowed as a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountain of the house as the high places of the forest."

Such are some of the many prophecies relating to the destruction of Jerusalem, the very name of which *thrills* and *awes* the heart of man. Josephus, in his War-book, gives us a glowing description of this dreadful catastrophe and destruction; and it appears from this history that insurrections were already there forming among them, before being encompassed by the army of Titus—their own sacred and hallowed altars were already drenched and deluged with the blood of their priests and people, caused by the broils and dissensions then and there existing. And hence, as their altars were polluted, and their day of grace gone, their sacrifices were ineffectual. God was no longer their Friend and Protector; and many earnestly desired the external war they saw hanging over them, in preference to these internal calamities. But amid this slaughter and desperation between the votaries of John and Eleazar—the leaders of the two factions—God was guiding the Roman army to chastise them for their impiety and rebellion. When Titus drew up his armed force before that powerful and recently impregnable city, he offered terms of pardon to the rebellious nation if they would surrender, and acknowledge allegiance to the Roman power; but they spurned all such offerings, when reason itself should have taught them that their walls were any thing else but invincible. And then were the words of our text verified: "Thine ene-

mies shall cast a trench about thee, and compass thee round, and keep thee in on every side, and shall lay thee even with the ground, and thy children within thee; and they shall not leave in thee one stone upon another." After the first and second walls were demolished, again embassadors were sent to effect a reconciliation; but their stubbornness refused to yield when their hope of success was no better than a wild phantom or an idle vagary; and the destruction of those who endeavored to allay the war, or recommend terms of submission, was certain. At this period commenced the terrible famine, with all its appalling consequences, which destroyed thousands; still they persisted in saving the city when God had forsaken them, so blinded were they by passion and sin. Titus finally built a wall around the city, and then the famine grew to such magnitude that whole houses were destroyed; and so great was the number of dead bodies thrown over the wall that even this sub-commander—Titus, under Vespasian—with all his other sins and enormities, wept when he saw the purtrefaction, and, stretching his hand toward heaven, called God to witness it was not his doing, but the perversity of the Jews. Still they persisted in their rebellion; and shortly after their temple was destroyed by fire, and with this destruction their hard and seared hearts began to relent—they discovered their ruin complete. One munition after another was demolished, the enthusiastic fury of the soldiery was intractable, and the slaughter immense—almost beyond conception!

Josephus relates some very remarkable occur-

rences connected with this affair. He says a "star resembling a sword stood over the city, and a comet that stood a year;" that a "light shone around the altar and the holy house that appeared to be bright day-time, which light lasted for half an hour," portending the destructive events which soon followed; and while the priests were performing their ministrations, at the day of Pentecost, they first felt a quaking, then heard a great noise, then a sound as of a multitude, saying, "Let us remove hence." But still more striking, a man of repute commenced crying: "A voice from the east, a voice from the west, a voice from the four winds, a voice against Jerusalem and the holy house, a voice against the bridegrooms and the brides, a voice against this whole people;" and though he received severe punishment, still his cry was: "Woe, woe to Jerusalem! woe, woe to Jerusalem! woe, woe to myself, also!" and as he uttered this cry, a stone from an engine killed him instantly. It was like the denunciations of Jonah, when he raised his voice, and said, "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown," and possibly as deeply inspired.

The Romans having become masters of the walls, shouts of victory followed the success they had gained. Their ensigns were placed upon the towers, young and old were put to the sword, houses were plundered and burnt; many fled to the subterranean caverns, there to meet an inglorious death; in a word, the streets literally ran down with blood—the carnage was of the most deplorable and heart-appalling character. The hand of God

was against that people—they had most persistently rebelled, and the punishment they received was of the most signal character. The commiseration of Heaven had fled, and they were left to the unrestrained licentiousness of their enemies, whose animosity toward them was of the most implacable character.

When Titus came into the city, and saw their formidable preparations for defense, he acknowledged the hand of God in their downfall and his triumph. The number that perished at this last siege, predicted by our Saviour, was eleven hundred thousand, and ninety-seven thousand were carried away captives to the different nations of the earth. Some were reserved for destruction in the theaters, and by wild, ravenous beasts; others for an ignominous servitude in the Egyptian mines.

The text says they "shall lay thee even with the ground." This was most signally consummated: the very foundations were dug up, and Jerusalem became a heap, a chaos, of ruin! And awfully were the words fulfilled: "His blood be upon us and our children." Thus was the destruction of Jerusalem accomplished—signally, awfully, literally. It had been encompassed before by the Babylonians, Egyptians, Antiochus, Pompey, and, after them, Sosius and Herod; but all were not so destructive as this last baleful massacre!

Matthew, relative to this subject, says: "Nation shall rise against nation." "This portended the dissensions, insurrections, and mutual slaughter of the Jews, and those of other nations, who dwelt in the same cities together; as particularly at Cesarea,

where the Jews and Syrians contended about the right of the city, which ended in the total expulsion of the Jews, above twenty thousand of whom were slain. The whole Jewish nation, being exasperated at this, flew to arms, and burnt and plundered the neighboring cities and villages of the Syrians, making an immense slaughter of the people. The Syrians, in return, destroyed not a less number of the Jews. At Scythopolis they murdered upward of thirteen thousand; at Ascalon they killed twenty-five hundred; at Ptolemais they slew two thousand, and made many prisoners. The Tyrians, also, put many Jews to death, and imprisoned more; the people of Gadara did likewise; and all other cities of Syria, in proportion as they hated or feared the Jews. At Alexandria the Jews and heathens fought, and fifty thousand of the former were slain. The people of Damascus conspired against the Jews of that city, and, assaulting them unarmed, killed ten thousand of them."

Matthew says, again: "Kingdom against kingdom." "This portended the open wars of different tetrarchies and provinces against each other: that of the Jews and Galileans against the Samaritans, for the murder of some Galileans going up to the feast of Jerusalem, while Cumanus was procurator; that of the whole nation of the Jews against the Romans and Agrippa, and other allies of the Roman Empire, which began when Gessius Florus was procurator; and that of the civil war in Italy, while Otho and Vitellius were contending for the empire." All these things substantiate the truths of inspiration. When history and revelation concur minutely,

infidelity's hydra-head diminishes, and loses its votaries. No rational man ean read the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew's Gospel and Josephus's "History of the Jewish War," and not have doubts relative to his skeptical attitude. Facts are too palpable to be hidden, too glaring for the investigating mind. Josephus was himself a Jew, and, aside from his deseriptive eoloring, is acknowledged to be an historian of indisputable veracity. He has written a commentary, unawares, upon the prediction of King Immanuel; and show me the infidel who has ever compared the Roman history, in the time of Vespasian and Titus, with Josephus and St. Matthew—one who has ingenuously examined these works—who has not renounced, or shuddered at, his skepticism.

I. Let us make this subject *applicable* to *ourselves*.

Jerusalem may be considered as a *type* of the *heart of man*. The Lord suffered long with that rebellious city. He wept over it. He urged and admonished its inhabitants to holiness, or purity. He portrayed a spiritual kingdom in all its beauty and magnificence. He said, Come, for all things are ready. He pointed to the typical priesthood as being abolished—that a new way was open for sin and uncleanness. He exhibited the superiority of the latter to the former dispensation—that God, who had "spoken in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, was now speaking by his Son." He showed the advantages, both temporal and spiritual, to be derived from the new kingdom; that the blood of bulls and goats could no longer put away sin; that the shadow had passed away, and the

adumbrated substance had come. He displayed the necessity of his shed blood to put away sin, and sanctify the human heart; but, notwithstanding these things, his admonitions were unheeded, and Calvary's mount witnessed their incorrigibility and saw this God-man die, and most horribly were they and their city destroyed! The same with the heart of man: God is long-suffering with the impenitent —he holds back his punishment; he manifests the influences of his Spirit to awaken the insensible heart to a sense of its wretched condition; he ordains a living ministry to arouse the sensual heart from its voluptuous lethargy; he places before man the truths of inspiration, teaching him life and death; he says to him: "He that being often reproved, hardeneth his neck, shall suddenly be destroyed, and that without remedy;" he lingers for the sinner to return; he urges him by all the ties of love to ground the arms of rebellion; he tells him "though his sins are as scarlet, they shall be whiter than snow;" but he cannot, consistently with his attributes, destroy man's moral agency, and his day of grace finally passes away, and his destruction is as signally consummated as was the destruction of Jerusalem. Examples of this kind have been numerous to both individuals and nations. Let us notice some such. How favored was the nation of which we have been speaking—the *Jews!* How refulgent was the light that shone around them when the Shiloh there appeared! They saw God face to face incarnated; they witnessed the miracles that followed his commands; they saw water turned into wine—the fig-tree

wither and die; they saw the eyes of the blind opened, the ears of the deaf unstopped, the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing; they saw the prodigies of the cross, the darkened sun, the vacated sepulcher, the ascension contrary to the law of gravitation; they heard the angels' song, "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will rd men;" they witnessed the demonstration of the Holy Spirit, the pentecostal shower; they heard illiterate men of foreign tongues speak, in the language of their own nations—"Parthians, Medes, Elamites, dwellers in Mesopotamia, Judea, Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, Egypt, and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, strangers of Rome, Jews, and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians"—the "wonderful works of God." They witnessed all these things, and still refused to acknowledge his claims, and accept his mercy; and his long-suffering was withdrawn, and his vengeance and indignation signally exercised. Their ulterior condition, as they now stand a monument to ages, fully shows that God cannot be trifled with, and though he bears long with the sinner, he finally smites him and exercises the attribute of his justice.

Take again the case of the *Amorites*. When God gave the promise to Abraham, that his seed should in the fourth generation inhabit the land of Canaan, he said: Go thy way, "for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." He bore with their wickedness over four hundred years, but they did not repent, and were finally driven out of the land Canaan.

Take the case of the *antediluvians*. Notwithstanding their heinous crimes, and their trifling with the warning of Noah, still God graciously waits one hundred and twenty years "while the ark was a preparing;" and as he saw no humility, but "only evil continually," he cuts them off and curses the race with the waters of the deluge.

Take, again, the *Gentile* nations, as contradistinguished from the Jews. For ages they were under heathen darkness—a mysterious subject to us, but probably caused by their rejecting former light from the Creator. Be this as it may, after the Jews rejected the gospel it was promulgated to the Gentiles. Equal privileges were proclaimed to them with God's former chosen people. The partition-wall was broken down, and peace proclaimed to those afar off—the Gentile world. A voice from Christ's embassadors, after Peter and Paul turned their attention that way, was daily urging them to be reconciled to God; to accept him as the King of kings, and Lord of lords; to take his yoke and learn his lenity; but many refused, and in consequence they died without hope or an interest in the blood of the Messiah.

Individual cases are no less pregnant and striking. Follow the man nurtured in the arms of piety. See him, after resisting the Spirit's influences and admonitions of friends for years, brought to the verge of the grave. The monitor has been rejected, the long endurance of Heaven spurned; he has gloried in his pride, and waxed strong in rebellion; but the hour of an avenging God has come, and he perishes miserably throughout futurity. And how lam-

entable to reflect upon these things! The same feeling pervaded the breast of the Saviour when he beheld, prospectively, the terrible siege of Jerusalem by the Romans, the unmitigated and unparalleled cruelty of the desperate soldiery. And Jeremiah's lamentation over her former miseries was applicable to her later sufferings: "How hath the Lord covered the daughter of Zion with a cloud in his anger, and cast down from heaven unto the earth the beauty of Israel!"

But, as one has said, "Where are the Churches to whom St. Paul addressed his blessed Epistles—Corinth, Ephesus, Colosse, Philippi, Thessalonica? They had their day, and for a time they improved it; but they grew weary of well-doing; and, melancholy fact! not one remains at all, or remains only as a picture of spiritual decay and corruption. And if the Apostle Paul could sigh amidst his felicities in heaven, he would sigh in tracing the contrast between the glorious monuments which his hallowed zeal left in Greece and the Lesser Asia and the desolations of God's judgments, and the wastes of spiritual death, in the same countries."

Their lamp of light is extinguished. The religion of the cross, which once characterized them as a people, is gone, and superstition and corruption are there. And how forcibly is this fact seen in the dark ages of the world, when a sable mantle of gloom wrapped in dark night the former light and liberty of the gospel—when the head of popedom sat in the chair of the Almighty, acting as God, "showing himself that he was God!"

But though God waits long, his *judgments finally*

come. Our light decreases as the gospel is rejected, as the admonitions of Heaven's embassadors are disregarded. If we thrust from us forcibly the influences of the Spirit while striving with us, the gloom grows blacker and thicker; impressions are less easily made; we can sit and listen to thrilling appeals unmoved; Sinai's rumblings have no terror; the indignation of God is unheeded; the blessings of the gospel of peace have no allurement; the nobler principles of the man are conquered, and he gives up to the lust and depravity of his heart. He *may* be saved ultimately, but his case is exceedingly dangerous; and if such a one be saved, there is a period when God's mercies are closed; when the day of grace is gone; when man is "given up to hardness of heart, and reprobacy of mind," to "believe a lie and be damned;" and, doubtless, the perdition of many souls is sealed above ground for the rejection of divine and heavenly favors.

There is a time, we know not when,
A point we know not where,
That marks the destiny of men
To glory or despair.
There is a line, by us unseen,
That crosses every path;
The hidden boundary between
God's patience and his wrath.
To pass that limit is to die,
To die as if by stealth;
It does not quench the beaming eye,
Or pale the glow of health.
The conscience may be still at ease,
The spirits light and gay;
That which is pleasing still may please,
And care be thrust away.

But on that forehead God has set,
Indelibly, a mark,
Unseen by man, for man as yet
Is blind and in the dark.
And yet the doomed man's path below,
Like Eden, may have bloomed;
He did not, does not, will not know
Or feel that he is doomed.
He knows, he feels, that all is well,
And every fear is calmed:
He lives, he dies, he wakes in hell,
Not only doomed, but damned.

The time is not known, but the man in one sense dies; the beaming eye is not quenched, the spirits still flow with health, the conscience is at ease, and care is thrown aside, but the man is dead, cursed and doomed by God; and while he feels that all is well, he passes away, and wakes up in the gulf of everlasting perdition.

Now, is this really true? or is it merely the hallucination of the preacher? Is it really the truth of God? or the random declamation of man? By consulting a few plain passages of the word of God, we may be able to arrive at a definite and true conclusion. Take the following:

"I have called, and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded," therefore, "they *shall call*, but I will not *answer;* they shall seek me early, but *they shall not find me.*" God called them in their day of grace, convicted them by his Spirit, urged them in various ways to seek pardon, but they refused, and sinned away their day of grace. Their calamity came; they prayed to fear, they prayed to hell, but God would not

hear them; he "laughed at their calamity, and mocked when their fear came." In this sense their probation was ended, though they were still alive upon the earth.

Again: "And thou Solomon my son, know thou the God of thy father, and serve him with a perfect heart and with a willing mind: if thou seek him, he will be found of thee; but if thou forsake him, *he will cast thee off forever.*" When did Solomon forsake God? Was it at the hour of death? Long before this he became an idolater. He disobeyed God in the affinity which he made with Pharaoh's daughter. He worshiped Ashtoreth, the Venus of the Zidonians; and Mileom, the abomination of the Ammonites; and Chemosh, of the Moabites; and Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon. To each of these he built a temple and sacrificed, and burnt incense to the gods of his strange wives. The light of God departed from him long before death, and he persisted in these things to old age. We are informed of his death in the midst of his apostasies. There is no proof of his repentance, but the end of his career shows conclusively that he died an alien from God, fulfilling God's own condition with him: "If thou forsake me, I will *cast thee off forever.*" This man's day of grace closed when he *first forsook God* and became an idolater. "*If thou forsake me, I will cast thee off forever.*"

Again: "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." Some make this refer to the antediluvians, and their respite of one hundred and twenty years, which is all true; but it also proves that there are circumstances in which men can and may so sin that

God's Spirit refuses to strive with them; and if so, it is clear that their day of grace has passed away, being given up to judicial blindness.

Again: Why did God *harden Pharaoh's heart?* It is said that he hardened his own heart, and that God hardened his heart; but why? Paul tells us: "He was a vessel of wrath *fitted to destruction.*" He had so sinned away his day of grace—so refused to see the powerful hand of God in the miracles before him—that he was given up, because *fitted for destruction* by his *own acts;* and it proves—the only use we have for it here—that his probation, in reference to his spiritual destiny, terminated before the hour of death; that he was given up to "hardness of heart and reprobacy of mind."

Again: "If thou hadst known, even thou, at least in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes." And he goes on to tell us the reason: "Because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." Some try to make this language refer exclusively to the doom of the city of Jerusalem, and their political polity. But it is said here that those things are "hid from their eyes which belonged to their peace;" and they had been told of the coming destruction of Jerusalem, and their polity, in various ways—they were told of it in this very connection: their enemies were to cast a trench about them, and lay their city even with the ground. These things were not hid from them—it was something else: it was those things necessary to an inward peace; and this blindness grew out of the fact that they would not know, or heed, or regard, their time of visitation. They

refused Christ in the character in which he came. Jerusalem was a cage of unclean birds; and the destruction of their temple and city was merely subsidiary to the other destruction coming upon them, now "hid from their eyes, because they would not know the time of their visitation."

Again: "For this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." How could language be plainer or stronger? God could not send delusion upon them after they were dead, and therefore the passage refers to this life. Some prefer giving it this turn: Because they were perpetrating all manner of wickedness, and loved not the truth that they might be saved, but had pleasure in unrighteousness, God *permitted* strong delusion to come upon them, so that they believed a lie in preference to the truth, that they might be damned, or condemned. Now, where is the difference, whether God *permits* delusion to come upon or directly sends it, as our translation states, if it ultimates in their damnation? There is no difference, in a practical point of view, and this is what we are aiming at in the settlement of this question. The most of the best informed writers on theology admit our translation to be the true one. I receive it heartily; and it tells me that God sends strong delusion upon a certain class of sinners, so they will believe a lie and be damned. Their former conduct, like Pharaoh's, leading God to give them up, it may be years before they pass away from this stage of action. And you see the truth of this in

every community. You can go around and almost call out, with considerable certainty, such men by name. They are never seen at the Church of God, unless called there by curiosity. Their consciences are perfectly at ease, and they live and die without God in the world.

But again: "It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Here were men, as explained in another passage, who had been pardoned and sanctified, and had so fallen that they had "trodden under foot the Son of God, and counted the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and had done despite unto the Spirit of grace"—denied the efficacy of this blood, and ridiculed the Holy Spirit, who had been the agent in their sanctification and enjoyment. Well, Paul says "it is *impossible*" to renew such men; and when he says a thing is *impossible*, I take it he means precisely what he says. He knew what the word *impossible* meant; and using it in reference to certain men who had been sanctified, and stating they could not be renewed, shows that their day of grace was passed, though they were still alive upon the earth. Anyone who thinks that a man cannot sin away his day of grace before he dies would do well to read carefully Paul's opinion as set forth in the book of Hebrews.

Finally: There is spoken of in the Gospels a "sin against the Holy Ghost, which has no forgiveness in this world, nor the world to come." It is no difference what this sin is. I believe any blasphemy of the Holy Ghost, or any ridicule of his agency in man's conversion, is the sin against the Holy Ghost, where men have the light to know better; but it matters not, in the present case, what the sin is: all I want to develop is, it has no forgiveness when committed; and if not, the man's day of grace is surely gone; and if a man commits it, he is a living witness of the theory that a man may be doomed to damnation, past repentance, past the convictions of the Holy Spirit, past the spiritual desire, or even a possibility, of salvation, though he is here in the flesh, with the rose upon his cheek, and may live many days in the future.

From all these passages, and others which could be adduced, we think it very clear that a man may be doomed to eternal perdition long before he leaves this stage of action; and this is not Calvinism—it is as different from this as day from night. Calvinism makes God the author, but the position I here maintain makes man the author of his own destiny.

But you may know whether you are in this condition or not. If you are still concerned, if you still desire salvation, if you still have compunctions of conscience, you are not among the doomed—you may still find pardon by repentance. And let me urge you to flee the wrath of an offended God while it is yet day, while the privileges of the gospel are granted you—before the night of darkness shall overtake you, and banish you from the long-suffer-

ing of the Author of your salvation. Seek the happiness Adam enjoyed before the fall. Holiness is in reservation for the heart of man. The depravity of man he eradicates. The sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit have power to renovate the moral nature and energies of man. A grasping, undoubting faith successfully operates, and man becomes like heaven —pure, hallowed, sanctified. Though he breathes the element of earth, he feasts upon the element of immortality. The Spirit commingles with his, "and neither death, nor life, nor things present, nor things to come, nor principalities, nor powers, nor any other creature, can separate him from the love of God, through Christ Jesus our Lord." Renounce your idols, and seek this happiness, then, that with all the redeemed you may finally sing the song of victory, of Moses and the Lamb.

And suppose you were standing upon the margin of this earth, and saw floating by you an orb of darkness, where all was dreary, where nothing enchanting could be seen, where no song of the feathered warbler could be heard, where you would have no familiar friend to converse with, but where all was lonely and miserable—you would not exchange the globe you now occupy, with all its unhappiness, for one of augmented misery. You would fondly cling to this, and let the dreary orb gladly roll by you. Suppose, again, that while in this condition, another planet should appear, where all was melody, where the most harmonious music was heard, where all was pleasant to the eye, where all was health and strength, and death a stranger, where nothing was wanting to complete perpetual happiness—your

mind would be changed; the enchanting scene would allure you, and you would say, Farewell, orb of my childhood, I leave you for greater joys! and you would step off your own former home and become an inhabitant of this delightful stranger.

Well, speaking without figure, you are in this condition. You are standing upon the verge of the planet earth. Heaven and hell are passing by you. One presents all its darkness, horror, and misery; the other its peace, loveliness, and bliss. You are called upon to choose, and, strange and fatal absurdity, you choose the dark ball, with all its dreariness and pain, and let go by, never more to return, the orb of happiness and ineffable delight! Is this wisdom? Nay, it is absurd; of all follies, surely this is the greatest.

"Thine enemies shall lay thee even with the ground, because thou knewest not the time of thy visitation." The Jews would not regard the time of visitation—would not recognize it, would not profit by it, would not heed it—and the day passed by, and they were destroyed. And the reason why the sinner has been, and will be, destroyed, is, he will not regard his day of mercy—will not profit by it, will not heed it, will not yield to its requirements, will not recognize the grace God has given him; and he passes away without an interest in the fountain opened for "sin and uncleanness."

And the condition of many men may be illustrated by a circumstance which transpired off the coast of Norway, in the dreadful maelstrom. You have heard of this awful vortex. The waters around it at a distance are calm and silent—unruffled they

lie at composure; but as you draw near, the waters begin to boil and foam, and tend toward the center; and so great is the force of this suction that large ships and whales, venturing too near, have been drawn into the whirl to appear no more forever! On one occasion, a company of the gay and thoughtless ventured in a pleasure-boat around this dreadful king of the ocean. Nearer and nearer they drew to the pool, as if to tempt, with their puny strength, the raging billows just beyond them. Their friends upon the shore, seeing their apparent danger, gave the alarm in vain. They only received it with shouts of joy. As they came around again, the effort was once more made to arouse them to a sense of the ruin impending just over them. A cannon was fired from the shore, but as they heeded it not, their friends sat down in silence to await the result. They came around the last time, and then the effort was made to row to the land; but, alas! that effort was too late! They had ventured too far, and their energy and strength were powerless; and faster and faster this whirl drew their frail bark, and with one wild yell the boat went down never more to appear!

The sinner is in this condition. Ahead is the great maelstrom, the blazing magazine of the pit. Sin is the pleasure-boat on which he is sailing. He is nearing the awful vortex. His friends are sounding the alarm, but he heeds it not. He intends by and by returning to his Father's house. But he has ventured too far. Every effort he makes only throws him nearer the awful gulf; and with one appalling shriek his soul enters the remorses of eternity!

If anyone who reads this still has convictions of conscience, still desires salvation, we would urge you to be wise unto salvation, repent of your sins, seek an interest in Jesus, love and serve God before it is *too late*, and he arises in his wrath and swears you shall never enter into his rest. We urge you to decide at once, this very *moment*, to live for God, or he may decide that his Spirit shall leave you in darkness, in delusion, exclusively to your idols.

THE DANCING DAMSEL.

BY THE REV JAMES A. HENDERSON, M.D.

"And brought his head in a charger, and gave it to the damsel; and the damsel gave it to her mother."—Mark vi. 28.

THERE were many wild and strange notions entertained by the people in the land of Judea, in the days of Herod the king, concerning Jesus Christ, our blessed Master. Many of them supposed him to be one of the old prophets, risen from the dead—others said, "That it is Elias;" but when King Herod heard of him, he said, "It is John, whom I beheaded: he is risen from the dead."

The opinion of Herod concerning him was different from the opinion of anyone else; for when Herod learned that Jesus did such mighty works—as giving sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, causing the lame to walk, and raising the dead—he reäffirmed, "It is John, whom *I* beheaded."

My hearers, wherever you find an idle faith, there is generally a working fancy. Those who fight against the cause of Christ will find themselves baffled, even when they think themselves conquerors. King Herod thought by killing John it would put him out of his way, and that "dead men tell no tales;" but John the Baptist murdered gave Herod more trouble than John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness.

Listen, if you please, to Herod accusing himself

of a crime of which no one else in all the realm durst accuse him: "*I* beheaded him."

Let us briefly notice the history as given in the chapter of which the text is a part. We read in verse 20: "Herod feared John, knowing that he was a just man and a holy, and observed him; and when he heard him, he did many things, and heard him gladly." You see from this how far a wicked man may go toward the kingdom of grace and glory, and yet come short of both. He not only feared John, but he loved him, and did many things John told him to do. Not every *man* who loves the preacher and goes to church shall be saved. Pause a moment, and note the history. "Herod had married his brother Philip's wife," and John, as a faithful minister of the word, told him, plainly, "It is not lawful." It might be dangerous to offend the king, but John knew it was much more so to offend God—high over all, the King of heaven. When Herodias, the wife of the king, heard what John had said about her union with Herod, she "had a quarrel against him, and would have killed him; but she could not." But she "nursed her wrath," and finally laid the plot, and had the grand old hero slain. Herod's gratitude for John was strong till he was reproved of sin, and then his *love* was turned into hatred. O what a life-like picture is this! Many persons pretend to honor preaching and love the preacher so long as they say nothing about their darling sins. Look at the plot laid to take John's life: The king's birthday is coming—the day in which he was born, or the day he began to reign, for both were termed birth-

days—and a *ball* must be given, and a grand supper prepared, for King Herod, his lords, his high captains, and chief nobles of his empire. It is a *ball* in high life, given by the king and queen—none but the noble and royal are invited; and then, to grace the occasion, the daughter of the queen must be requested to *dance*, and to dance alone, *publicly*. She performs a *solo dance;* and that bright dancing damsel, was *Salome*, the daughter of Herodias by her former husband. The *graceful* manner in which she performed this *dance* so pleased Herod, already flushed with wine, that he became very much excited, and took a solemn oath that he would give the damsel "whatsoever she asked, even unto the half of his kingdom." Little did Herod know that this laughing girl had been instructed by her wicked mother to demand the head of the forerunner of Jesus; and he was pained and grieved when, instead of asking for some bright and costly gift, she asked for John's head. "Give me by and by in a charger the head of John the Baptist." The word charger signified a dish, or bowl. But why ask for it in a *dish?* Because the mother did not intend that her fair child should have her magnificent toilet soiled by the blood from the preacher's head. Poor John is not only to lose his head, but it is to be publicly exhibited in a *ball-room* to the gaze of the drunken assembly! As Pollok says, "It is enough to make the cheek of dark damnation pale" to gaze on a scene like this. But why bring it in a charger? Why not take it by the hair, or scalp? Why not let the head remain with the corpse? Why

bring the head to the girl? Ah! she is to take it and give it to her fiend-like mother. This was an awful sight; yet it was seen. Poor girl! I pity all such in my soul—educating your feet instead of your head and heart. This damsel's mother, no doubt, imagined her daughter well accomplished, an elegant dancer; yet her mind was utterly destitute of intellectual culture.

I imagine I see the little dancer going to her mother and asking, Shall I ask the king for half of his kingdom? No. Shall I ask for a royal robe, a crown and seepter? No. Shall I ask for rubies and diamonds? No. Shall I ask to be his chief cup-bearer? No. For what, then, shall I ask? See the cunning intrigue of her wicked mother. My daughter, that old slanderer, John the Baptist, once said "it was not lawful" for Herod and *me* to marry; he is now in prison in this empire. I demand of you that you request the king, my husband, to give you "in a charger the head of John the Baptist." And, in the language of the text, they "brought his head in a charger, and gave it to the damsel; and the damsel gave it to her mother."

O fiendish woman! to make such a request of a modest young girl. Would you have her fair young hands stained with the blood of God's prophet? O how much better for that fair one if she had never learned to *dance!* She has lived all her young life, and only learned to play the fool!

Said the drunken king, I will give her "half of my kingdom." A noble price for a dance! When she made the silly request, "the king was exceeding

sorry," because he knew John was a good and true man; yet for "his oath's-sake," which it was a breach of honor to break, he commanded the head to be given, and it was given; and she gave it to her mother. There is no person so revengeful as a wicked and designing woman when her anger is kindled. A faithful preacher of the gospel has *most* to fear from this quarter. John lost his life for uttering the "*truth*," and yet we are told by the dancing women of the land, "There is no harm in it." It is *only* an "innocent amusement;" and yet *you* have the *facts* before *you* in *this case* that dancing led to dissipation, and dissipation to making a *foolish* "oath," and a foolish oath to murder. Away forever with the soul-damning doctrine that there is *no harm* in a thing, when it leads to crime and cold-blooded murder! as it did in the case of poor John the Baptist, the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, of whom it is said, "He shall drink neither wine nor strong drink;" and yet he is murdered as the result of a *wine-party*, at which there were *dancing* and *drinking*.

The text affirms, She gave the "head" to her mother. What did the mother do with the head? The Bible is so disgusted with the scene that it is silent upon the subject—silent as the grave. How she received this gift from her daughter we are not told; "but there is a tradition that she took the head of John in the dish, in her room, from the public gaze, and laying it on a table, she stripped off the diamonds from her fingers, and then taking hold of the cold, dead tongue, she drew it forth from his mouth, and driving her bodkin through it,

she said, There is the foul tongue that slandered me—it will slander me no more; and she commanded the servants to throw it upon the commons to rot." Poor, wicked fiend! This is a sad commentary upon the boasted accomplishment of dancing.

A dancing young lady was once asked by a pious minister if she believed in God the Father, in Jesus Christ his Son, in the Holy Ghost, in heaven, in hell, in the immortality of the soul, and a final judgment-day; if she believed in the divine origin of the Church of God; if she believed good people ought to belong to it. She answered all the questions in the affirmative; yet when he asked her why she did not join the Church, she replied: I love to *dance*, and do not wish to give it up. Now, reader, that young lady put in one side of the gospel scales God, Christ, the Holy Ghost, immortality of the soul, heaven, hell, the judgment, the resurrection of the dead, and yet she could not afford to give up *dancing* and put it in the other side of the scales; and, in her estimation, dancing "outweighed them all."

Judas, the traitor, once sold his Master for *thirty pieces* of silver, lived and died, and went to hell; and the world has proclaimed the transaction unwise and reckless down through the ages past; but here is a transaction, taken as a rule in business, that would prove fatal to the race, and bankrupt the universe of God.

The evil of dancing is obvious; it leads to vice and crime. In the case in this chapter, it led to sinful excitement, a foolish oath, and a willful mur-

der. And how many times, my dear young friends, has it led to loss of health, the loss of friends, the loss of life, and the loss of the soul? I speak from experience. Once I was very fond of this amusement; but when I joined the Church, and took upon myself the badge of religion, I felt that "old things had passed away, and all things had become new." What "old things" had passed away? Old desires, old habits, old vices, old sins, old thoughts, old feelings, and old passions. I once loved to *dance;* now I hate it as I hate the devil, and I shun it as I would shun a pest-house or the foul pit. When the soul is soundly converted to God, there is no desire to *dance.* "Behold, all things are become new:" new man, new creation, new hopes, new faith, new desires, new feelings, new love, new joy, new song; the heaven above looks new, the forest looks new, the birds sing new. "Behold, *all* things are become new:" the drunkard gets drunk *no more*, the dancer dances *no more*, the thief steals *no more*, the liar lies *no more*, the gambler plays cards *no more.*

Salome's dancing was evil, because it led to evil; and yet her dancing was the least objectionable form of dancing—it was a *solo* dance, and that by a female dancer at home, in her mother's house. The parties who now advocate our modern promiscuous *round* dance often try to justify themselves by saying, The Scriptures teach dancing; but there is not a word of truth in it. Such a thing as the dancing of the *sexes* together is not to be found in the Bible. David danced before the ark, but it was a religious service; Miriam danced at the Red Sea, but it was a solemn religious service, for God had

given them the victory; but I affirm to-day, There is not a single example of our modern fashion of dancing, the men and women together, in all the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation. I furthermore affirm that *all* the religious denominations of the world that are evangelical, or orthodox, give the verdict against dancing; and I hope the day will soon dawn when none but the low and vulgar will dance, and then a brighter day will dawn again when *none* will dance.

Once more, and I have done. What was the fate of this dancing family? Herod was smitten of God, died, and was eaten of worms. Herodias was banished, and died in disgrace. Salome, the daughter, was dancing upon a beautiful lake of ice; the ice parted, her body went down, her "head" was *cut off* by the ice!

THE END.